

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XXIV. No. 14 }
WHOLE No. 591 }

January 22, 1921

{ \$4.00 A YEAR
PRICE, 10 CENTS }

CONTENTS

CHRONICLE	PAGE 321-324
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Christian Rites and Their Origins—Fordham University, Molder of Men—English Opinion and the Irish Crisis—Propaganda.....	325-332
COMMUNICATIONS	332-333
EDITORIALS	
Dean West and the Smith Bill—January 19, 1807—What Would Newman Say of Ireland Now—Obliging Censors—A Policeman in Every Home	334-337
LITERATURE	
"King of Preachers and Preacher of Kings"—A Hermit of Main Street—Reviews—Books and Authors	337-340
EDUCATION	
The Unamendable Smith Bill.....	341-342
SOCIOLOGY	
The Communist International in the United States	342-343
NOTE AND COMMENT	343-344

Chronicle

Austria.—The Austrian Government recently served notice on the principal allied and associated powers that it could not continue the administration of the nation after

January 15. The final step compelling this action, according to a dispatch to the *New York Times*, was the demand by Government clerks for an increase of 1,000,000,000 *Kronen* a month in salaries, owing to the almost incredible depreciation of Austrian money. More than 500 *Kronen* are now given in Austria for one single American dollar. January 15 was the date set for the expiration of the ultimatum presented by the Government employees. Professor Joseph Redlich was delegated by the Austrian Government to inform President-elect Harding of Austria's commercial, financial and political situation, and to confer with American statesmen and financiers. He hopes, it is said, to raise a loan in the United States. It is further reported that a conference of the different new States that were formerly part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire is to take place in Vienna. Its purpose will be to study the situation and to inquire into possible ways of preventing the total collapse of the Austrian nation. The United States has been invited to participate. Some help must certainly be

given to save the people from starvation. The country is in virtual bankruptcy.

Jugo-Slavia.—A Communist plot to establish a Soviet government in Jugo-Slavia has fortunately been frustrated in time to save the State from utter ruin. The

Communist Plot Discovered

Communists had accomplices in the ranks of the Royal Guard, the police, the army and the telephone service. They were ready to seize the mails and to establish communications with Moscow. The *coup d'état* was to be launched during the sittings of the Constituent Assembly, and was to begin with a general strike. Bombs, explosives and fire-arms had been procured in abundance, and the Communists were ready to seize the newspapers. According to the statement of the Jugo-Slavia Minister of the Interior, M. Drachovitch, the Communists planned the murder of himself, as well as of the Minister of War and of the ex-Premier Vesnitch. Many of the men who had made exorbitant profits from the sale of the necessities of life were found on the side of the Communists. The expulsion of all foreigners implicated in the plot was ordered. Several hundred avowed Communists were imprisoned and many Government officials suspended. A raid on Communist headquarters disclosed a large quantity of incriminating documents. The newspapers are said to have been prepared to enter into their service.

Germany.—President Ebert has sent out a message of warm appreciation for the relief work being done in Germany by the various foreign agencies to alleviate "the misery prevailing among large sections of our people." The countries occupying first place in this connection, he says, are Germany's neighbors, Denmark, Finland, Holland, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland.

Gratitude for Relief Work

The warm-hearted and careful reception given to the children of our people in those countries for months at a time during the past years offsets the grave dangers to which the rising generation has been exposed by the war and its accompanying phenomena, in a mental as well as a physical sense, and thus pursues an aim which goes far beyond the present day misery and is bound to be particularly appreciated by us Germans.

Similar aims are served by the relief activities of the Quakers. They have supplemented their feeding of the school children with the same care for needy adults. And other circles of the population of the United States are displaying far-reaching relief activities in the form of gift packages and remittances of money. Substantial aid, promoted by warm sympathy, has also come from the South American nations.

The death-rate in Germany, compared with 1913, in-

creased nine per cent in 1915, fourteen per cent in 1916, thirty-two per cent in 1917, and thirty-seven per cent in 1918. Tuberculosis increased fifty per cent.

It may be noted here that the League of French Women's Organizations, according to a statement of the Christiania *Norske Kvinders Nationalraad*, joined in the protests against the black troops that were stationed in Germany. The most objectionable of these, the Senegalese, have consequently now been withdrawn, although it is estimated that from 40,000 to 45,000 black troops still remain. The protest urging the removal of all such guards has been signed by seventy-one Dutch, Swedish, Austrian and German women's leagues. Congressman Britten has drawn up a resolution of protest which brings the question officially to the notice of the American Congress.

France.—The Leygues Ministry was overthrown on January 12 by the unprecedented vote of 463 to 125. The vote means that the Chamber was not satisfied with what

Fall of the Leygues Ministry

it considered the too lenient policy of the Prime Minister and his Cabinet towards Germany. M. Leygues pleaded in vain with the Chamber to be allowed to retain office together with his colleagues at least until after the conference of the Allied Premiers which is to take place on January 19, but the Chamber listened to his plea with icy silence. On January 11, the Prime Minister had tried to negotiate with various groups which intended to attack him, and for some time he believed that his government was safe for at least two weeks. Nevertheless on January 12 when the crisis came, he was faced by no less than five formal interpellations from members in every part of the House. Durand Bechet interpellated him about the state of the domestic finances; Maurice Renaud on German disarmament; Lacotte on the Government's policy towards England; Bokanowski on foreign finance, and Deyris on the general policies of the Ministry. M. Leygues begged that these interpellations be for the present postponed. "The representatives of foreign governments are coming to Paris with hands free to negotiate with us," he cried. "It is indispensable that the French Government should be in the same position." But the appeal made little or no impression on the members. At this moment, M. Bonnevey, the National bloc leader, mounted the tribune and declared: "The Government asks for our blind confidence. This we cannot give." After the adverse vote which immediately followed, M. Leygues and his ministers left the Chamber and handed their resignation to President Millerand.

It was no easy task to appoint a successor to the fallen Minister and his Cabinet. For the French people demanded two things of its political chiefs, rigid application of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles towards Germany, more especially of the reparational and disarmament clauses, and the preservation of the Franco-British Alliance. To make both these ends meet, the new

Premier, it was understood, must be a clear-headed statesman. Although he had at first declined the request of M. Millerand to form a Cabinet, M. Raoul Peret, the President of the Chamber of Deputies, yielding to a second request, attempted to organize one. According to the first draft made, M. Peret was to hold the post of Premier and Minister of the Interior; M. Briand, that of Foreign Affairs; M. Loucheur, that of Finance; M. Bonnevey, that of Labor; M. Raiberti, that of War; M. Ghust'au, that of Instruction. But this tentative Cabinet met with little favor with several of the groups in the Chamber, especially with the Conservatives, who found that it swung too much towards the Left. M. Peret had ultimately to give up his attempt to organize the new government. His failure was also due to the refusal of former President Poincaré to enter the combination, except under conditions that made it difficult for M. Peret to carry out his program. Poincaré, it was understood, desired the post of Foreign Minister, but M. Peret had picked out M. Briand for that office, because of the latter's qualities as a negotiator and his strength with the European chancelleries. Another obstacle was the determination of the Radicals not to permit a member of their group to enter the Cabinet, unless it was agreed that the new Government would consent to withdraw from the Senate the measure passed by the Chamber of Deputies renewing the French diplomatic representation at the Vatican. On the failure of M. Peret to form a government, M. Millerand asked M. Briand to try the task. On January 16 a Ministry was formed, in which M. Briand took the portfolio of Foreign Affairs, Louis Barthou, that of War, Paul Doumer, that of Finance, M. Bonnevey, that of Justice. Yves le Trocquer and Louis Loucheur are also members of the Cabinet.

By a decree of President le Mercier of the Eleventh Correctional Chamber, the French Courts dissolved the General Confederation of Labor on January 13. The

Labor Federation Dissolved

motive assigned for this momentous decision was that the Confederation had actively attempted to aid the Russian Bolshevik revolution. The Court also fined M. Jouhaux, Secretary-General of the Confederation; his assistant, M. du Moulin, and three other officers 100 francs each on technical charges. The decree of dissolution declares that the Confederation made itself "not an instruction of education and union, as provided in the law of 1884, but an instrument of class war." It further states that "no government can tolerate what constitutes under a Syndicalist mask another government created by a minority of agitators and which pretends to impose the wishes of this minority." The court also reviewed the revolutionary activities of the Confederation, mentioning in evidence various appeals and threats to strike in favor of the Russian Bolshevik Government, denunciations of French aid to the enemies of the Soviet, and finally the attempt of a revolutionary strike last July.

Ireland.—In an article entitled "Frightfulness in Ireland," the *Toronto Statesman* of January 8 calls attention to the fact that the Canadian press, which has been hitherto, for the most part, indifferent to Ireland, and in some cases bitterly hostile, is beginning to see the light.

Canadians, perfectly sincere and honest, the article declares, have been deluded into the belief that much of the news of official atrocities and reprisals is exaggerated or untrue, but the mass of testimony is growing to such a volume and the witnesses are so clearly beyond suspicion that public opinion is coming to the reluctant conclusion that the tales of British official frightfulness in Ireland are terribly true. "Truth is mighty, and the huge propaganda organization of the British Government, utilized so widely during the war, and which at its close was promptly turned with all its power on the Irish situation, is failing to 'fool the people all the time.'" After calling attention to the fact that the *Ottawa Witness* recently exposed the suppression of the speech depicting conditions in Ireland made by Mr. Asquith on December 17, 1920, the *Statesman* continues:

As a result many Canadians now find themselves in the same position as that famous Englishman, Father Bernard Vaughan, who states: "For a long time I refused to believe that reprisals were being used by any forces under English control in Ireland. Alas with sorrow and shame, I now hang my head, confessing aloud our guilt." So, too, should any Canadian who loves freedom; who loves humanity and who is honest enough with himself to consider the opinions which follow from noted English Protestants and the unpurchased section of the British press.

The *Statesman* then goes on to quote from the recent utterances of a number of English public men. Mr. Henry W. Nevinnson apologizes to the shades of Abdul Hamid and Czar Nicholas, whose rule he had often, in his capacity of an English journalist, severely criticized:

The conduct of our own British Government in Ireland has proved to me that no Englishman ever had the right to denounce or condemn any crime you or your Ministers may have perpetrated. And to continue and increase these methods of treachery, violence and injustice, the Prime Minister of England now openly encourages his agents.

Sir Herbert Samuel is equally severe in his unqualified condemnation of English methods in Ireland:

Ireland is now being governed under military law. If what is now going on in Ireland was going on in the Austrian Empire all England would be ringing with denunciation of the Hapsburgs and of the denial to people of the right to rule themselves. England is today shamed before the whole world on account of Ireland.

Mr. Robert Lynd, literary editor of the *London Daily News*, analyzes both the methods and the motive behind the British reprisals:

One hears on very excellent authority that what has happened in Dublin Castle is that a whole kennel of bulldogs is gone mad. The dangerous feature of the situation is that these creatures, instead of being put under restraint, are employed and valued as watch-dogs and even as bloodhounds. A general anti-barking order prevails throughout Ireland, but the mad dogs of Dublin Castle are given free run of the country. They are suffering,

it is said, from a special form of rabies known as Rabies Teutonica, and apparently it is hoped that if they are allowed to bite enough people the Irish will sink into a general stupor marked by loss of appetite for liberty and loss of memory of nationhood.

The *Manchester Guardian* describes the effects of the ill-advised policy of outrage which has been committed to the uncontrolled bands of Black and Tans:

Fleeing in terror from their homes, the young men (in Ireland) have been recruited for the murder gang, and where formerly the desperadoes moved in small groups they are now battalions. Wherever the rule of the Black and Tan has been most lawless the counter viciousness has asserted itself like the hatching of serpents' eggs. The stupidity of the Irish policy is well revealed in the arrest of Mrs. Annan Bryce and the shutting up of the Duke of Leinster's house. Innocent lives, in uniform and out of it, are sacrificed; rebels are made, Ireland is ruined and the hope of peace with honor receded.

The incompetence of Lloyd George and his alliance with Sir Edward Carson are bitterly scored by Lord Bentinck, M.P., and the indefeasible right of the majority of the Irish people to be ruled as they desire is vindicated.

His [Lloyd George's] incapacity to govern Ireland becomes more manifest every day. The land is filled with violence and upon his failure lawlessness and crime flourish apace. His incapacity arises from the fact that he persists in ignoring the simplest rules of democratic government. Who can crush the spirit of a nation? Who can successfully deny either the fundamental unity of the Irish people or their right to be ruled by the majority of their own people? From the moment the Prime Minister recognizes that the only method by which Ireland can be governed is by the consent of its people will the Irish sky begin to brighten. From the moment that the Government cease their futile efforts to kill Republicanism by force will loyalty to the Empire begin to gain ground. But what hope is there that the Prime Minister will embrace the cause of liberty and justice while he is tied to his alliance with Sir Edward Carson? That is the governing factor in this tragic situation. Surely the happiness and welfare of millions of people are more important than the personal position of one man.

The *Statesman* quotes the testimony of Mr. John H. Barlow, formerly chairman of the London Society of Friends, who was commissioned with two others by the executive committee of the Society of Friends to go to Ireland in order to investigate the condition of that country. At the time of his visit seventeen cooperative creameries had been wrecked. Of this destruction, he declares, a considerable portion must be laid at the door of the so-called forces of law and order. "We visited Lisburn, where the fury of the mob found expression in the burning out of the houses of the Roman Catholics and the expulsion of all Roman Catholics from the town. The place was like a city within the war zone." But it was Limerick, says Mr. Barlow, which gave the commission an insight into the meaning of reprisals.

Lord Monteagle points out that the most common form of reprisals has been the burning of creameries, and states that at the time of his writing, although twenty-six such burnings had taken place, nothing effective had been done to stop them. After giving several instances which

he personally had investigated, he asks: "Why are reprisals tolerated if not designed by the Government? Is it not because the Government knows that all but frightfulness has broken down?"

Mr. Arthur Henderson, M.P., the Labor leader, is quoted to show where lies the responsibility for the disorder which prevails in Ireland:

Up until the beginning of 1919 all the outrages had been on one side, that of the Government, and during 1919 there were 14,000 armed raids, three towns were sacked and ten civilians killed by its servants. Before 1919 there was only one policeman killed in Ireland.

The *Manchester Guardian* makes no attempt to shift from England's shoulders the blame for Ireland's state:

The history of Irish discontent is all perfectly obvious. We [England] sowed it, watered it, cultivated it, by every imaginable act of folly and greed from the destruction of Ireland's old industries in the eighteenth century and earlier centuries to the War's Office's refusal of Ireland's offer to help in the war of 1914. Now we have got the ripe fruit.

The conclusion reached by the *Manchester Guardian* is that England has to deal solely by its own fairness, courage and good sense with a mess of its own making, and has to deal with it at once.

Mexico.—Some interesting letters have begun to reach the United States from Mexico. It would appear from them that the golden age has not yet returned to that unhappy land. Thus, one estimable gentleman writes:

*Persecution and
Sickness*

Last week the Fathers of San Francisco, the fine church on Avenue Madero, were all violently expelled from their residence. A *comisario*, police and soldiers armed with rifles turned them out at 6.30 P. M., without previous notice and by force. The only explanation given was that all churches belong to the State. Strange to say, the church itself was not disturbed, only the residence. The President is very ill and seems to be doing nothing. Calles is apparently in the saddle, but it is understood that his health, too, is very precarious. Heart disease, so rumor has it. Hill was buried last week. Fifteen days before he had a row with another official. Blows were exchanged and all that, and this brought on a crisis in Hill's health.

This letter was written January 2; on January 7 the same gentleman wrote as follows:

On January 4, with an order from the Secretary of the Treasury, a band of armed men broke into the sacristy and store room of San Francisco, and roughly took possession. They moved all the contents, furniture, statues of saints, etc., in great disorder and confusion, some into the sanctuary and some into the transept of the church. You know San Francisco, the most central and frequented church in Mexico City. The scandal was awful! Things here are dreadfully bad.

A later letter from a prominent business man complains bitterly of the action of the Communists, as he calls the Mexicans in power, and announces that three banks have closed their doors, apparently to escape looting, for depositors are not to lose their money. This letter confirms the previous report about Obregon's health and declares that there have been numerous disturbances on account of frauds in the last election.

Rome.—Catholics throughout the world, those especially who in seminaries are training Catholic youth to the ways of sanctity and learning in the sacred priesthood, or in press or pulpit are defending the Faith, will learn with joy that the cause of the Beatification and

*The Venerable
Robert Bellarmine*

ultimately of the Canonization of the great Cardinal Bellarmine has again been taken up at Rome, after an interruption of 170 years. Jesuit, Archbishop of Capua, Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, incomparable controversialist, champion of the rights of the Holy See, defender of the rights of the people against the unjust claims of tyrants and kings, Robert Bellarmine was one of the greatest men of the middle of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries. His learning was equaled by his sanctity. In the middle of the eighteenth century, under the great Pope Benedict XIV, the cause of his Beatification was introduced at Rome, but owing to the vicissitudes of the times, and especially of the growing hatred towards the Society of Jesus, of which he had been one of the greatest ornaments, it had to be suspended. It is now taken up again by Benedict XV. In the last days of December of 1920, as we learn from the *Osservatore Romano*, in the Vatican palace, in the presence of his Holiness, the decree was solemnly read which certifies that the Venerable Servant of God, Robert Bellarmine of the Society of Jesus, had practised the Christian virtues in a heroic degree. From this moment on, these virtues will be still more closely examined into until it is proved beyond doubt that the servant of God merits the still more striking honors which the Catholic Church reserves to those whom she places upon her altars.

After the reading of the decree which now reopens the case of the Jesuit Cardinal, the General of the Society of Jesus, the Very Rev. Vladimir Ledochowski, warmly thanked the Holy Father for the honor he thus conferred upon the Society of which Robert Bellarmine had been a devoted son. To the address of Very Rev. Father Ledochowski, the Holy Father answered with a glowing eulogy of the Jesuit Cardinal. In Robert Bellarmine he finds a model for men who are called upon to practise the same virtues which adorned this great son of St. Ignatius, a model for professors, teachers, and directors of souls, who are bound to lead others to sacred and profane learning and to holiness, a model for Bishops and Princes of the Church to whom, as Archbishop of Capua and Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, this venerable servant of God gave in all things a wonderful example of unflagging zeal. Finally the Holy Father sees in Bellarmine, the great controversialist of his times, a model for all those who in any way are endeavoring to spread the light of the truth and combat error. Americans, irrespective of creed, should welcome the news of the honors conferred upon Robert Bellarmine, for he was the advocate and champion of those democratic principles which they so dearly prize and are so anxious to safeguard.

Christian Rites and Their Origins

HENRY WOODS, S. J.

ON Christmas eve the American National Geographical Society issued a bulletin telling how the Christmas-tree comes from our Aryan ancestors, its candles from Teutonic sun-worshippers and the mistletoe, fortunately with a gentler rite, from the Druids. The mince-pie is allowed to be an exclusively Christian tradition.

What this has to do with geography, and why a bulletin of the Geographical Society should reproduce a story trite before the Society's birth, are questions for its directors to settle. Were the story true, Christmas-trees would not be our only heritage from pagan ancestors. Trousers are so universal wherever the Christian religion prevails, that missionaries have been heard of, who dispensed with the Sacrament of Baptism and made the clothing of the outward man in a bifurcated garment, the outward sign, we would say efficient, if they believed in sacramental efficiency—of inward regeneration. Yet trousers, as we gather from Tacitus, are an inheritance from the Teuton and the Gaul, and so clearly barbarous that the region where they first met the Roman eye, became *Gallia Bracata* forever. But with regard to the theory underlying this piece of information about Christmas we have something very serious to say. Christmas-trees and mistletoe are not in themselves matters of religion; and the connecting of them with pagan rites interests only on account of the assumption that Christianity in its exterior practice is often only paganism under another name.

The notion is old enough. Gibbon reveled in it, and gladly acknowledged some obligations to Conyers Middleton for details. Nearly a hundred years ago, with that youthful confidence in mere assertion which years did not weaken, Macaulay wrote in his essay on Milton: "Soon after Christianity had achieved its triumph, it became a new paganism." Patron saints assumed the offices of household gods. St. George took the place of Mars. St. Elmo consoled the mariners for the loss of Castor and Pollux. The Virgin Mother and Cecilia succeeded to Venus and the Muses. A mere paraphrase and summary of Gibbon's dogmatism, it would be: Soon after the Revolution had achieved its triumph, America renewed the old British monarchy. President and Senators assumed the offices of King and nobles. Washington took the place of George III. Jefferson consoled the shipowners for the loss of Lord North. Lady Washington, Mrs. Knox, Mrs. Hamilton and Mrs. Adams succeeded to the lovely Queen Charlotte and her graceful princesses.

The essential difference between the Republican

American Constitution and the constitution of any limited monarchy, and the accidental social similarity to the usages of the British court of the Washington administration, by reason of the circumstances into which those connected with it had been born, are two well-known facts perfectly reconcilable. We might expect, therefore, that the essential difference between Christianity and paganism would be as readily perceived, as the similarity of a few Christian practices to those of pagan times.

That essential difference is manifest. Christianity is Divine, paganism, diabolic. Under its esoteric form it revealed to its adepts new infamies at every step. It was indeed the mystery of iniquity. Leto's son, the herdsman of Admetus and the builder of the Trojan wall, the patron of music and song, becomes the sun-god, then the destroyer and healer, master of life and death, and finally, lord of the convulsionary pythonesse, the fallen Lucifer. His sister is his female analogue: first, the virgin-huntress, then the goddess rejoicing, as Euripides says, in human victims, the never-sated monster of the Tauric Chersonesus, then again the mystery of Ephesus and lastly Hecate, queen of witchcraft in all its abominable forms—Persephone, torn from her flowers, to be the goddess of the nether world, mother of the furies, the swarthy and cruel, delighting in men's death, honored with human sacrifice and a sharer with Artemis in the character and attributes of Hecate. If more be needed to prove that the gods of the heathens are devils, it is at hand in what is known, and in much more hinted at by ancient writers, concerning the Eleusinian and Bacchic mysteries, and the mysteries of Cybele, the Bona Dea, Mithra and Isis, and the other abominations gathered from every pagan land.

But we do not need for our purpose the esoteric paganism. Varro, the most learned of Romans, whose lost work on this subject we know through the quotations in St. Augustine, explains three ways of regarding the false divinities, which he calls three theologies, namely; the fabulous, of the poets; the civil, of the people; the natural, of the philosophers. The poets tell of the base origins and shameful adventures attributed to the gods; the people, directed by priests, augurs and oracles engage in worship pleasing to the gods; the philosophers, seeing the degrading absurdities of poets, and he might have added, people, treat of the real nature of the divinity, but without being able to agree on any positive doctrine. St. Augustine, however, shows the fabulous and civil theologies to be only different phases of the same thing. What the poets feigned in obedience to the gods, the authorities made the matter of worship;

and when they failed to do so, the gods interfered. Thus by command of Jupiter, the poets' fables of his misdeeds were made the subject of scenic plays performed as acts of worship, which the people were bound to attend. But, asks the Saint, what kind of gods were they who delighted in a lie that made them monsters of depravity and who were honored by the incitement of their worshippers to similar depravity.

Side by side with this essential infamy that makes paganism the utter contrary of Christianity, appear phenomena which, as they came from the personal nature of individuals, not from the specific nature of idolatry, Varro seems to have passed over, but which form the basis of the thing we are refuting. Virgil tells of the simple worship of the rustic gods. So too Horace. Apart from the primitive revelation never wholly extinguished, man by an almost spontaneous conclusion of his reason knows in some way the existence of the higher, invisible power on whom he depends. In this men agree among themselves; and it becomes a social truth taught to successive generations, and accepted by the reason of each individual. Hence the religious habit of mind which leads men to have recourse to the powers above. And so Jocasta, unable to prevail with Oedipus, betakes herself to the nearest temple. Eurydice overhears the fate of her son while on the way to pay a visit of devotion to Pallas. The country maiden decks the altar of the god with flowers. Votive offerings testify to protection in peril. All the countryside holds that a divinity saved from wild beasts the sleeping child, Horace, lost on the mountain. Cicero, though a philosopher, moves the judges by seeing a supernatural intervention in the fact that Clodius was slain before the shrine of the Bona Dea, whose rites he had violated. Every house had its altar; every road its wayside shrine; noted temples were places of pilgrimage, just as today. But Christianity is no more a renewed paganism, than paganism was an anticipated Christianity.

The explanation is simple enough. Man is both material and spiritual, and, as such, must worship with an exterior, material rite as well as with interior, spiritual adoration. This is both a need and obligation of his nature; and God, that nature's Creator and Redeemer, provided for obligation and need in the temples, shrines, ceremonies, rites of the Catholic Church. In the introduction of idolatry, says St. Thomas, this nature, inordinate and corrupt, was the disposing cause. The consummating cause was a depraved affection or admiration for creatures and the natural desire to represent materially what is admired and loved which disposed those who had forgotten God to yield to the suggestions of the demons. Now, as the demons understand perfectly our human nature and its tendencies, so far is it from surprising that they should have brought into their worship similarities to what in God's providence was to be established in Christian worship, that it would be surprising did such similarities not exist. In connection with this

need of the exterior and material in religion recognized by both heaven and hell, we may remark, that the effort of pagan philosophers to get away from it reached the same result as does Protestantism when really emancipated, namely scepticism.

But idolatry and Christianity have so much in common, incense, lights, lustral waters, chants! In the first place, there is not so *much*. Those mentioned about complete the list. The things characteristic of idolatry, but never used by Christians, are many indeed. Demosthenes, reviling Aeschines, mentions among them, fawn skins, mud, bran, chaplets of fennel and poplar, serpents borne aloft, ivy, the winnowing-fan, the words of mystery shouted aloud; then there were the chests, wands, thyrsus, emblems of Priapus, the deafening tumult of trumpets, cymbals, and drums, and so on, all having a hidden but generally arbitrarily imposed meaning; while the few common to Christianity and idolatry have a ritual meaning obvious from their nature.

Still, it is urged, you cannot deny that pagan festivals have given occasion to the institution of Christian feasts. That is another question too long to be treated here. Suffice it to say that it deals, not with borrowing, reviving, reproducing under another name, which is the charge brought against us, but with *substituting* good for evil, Christian worship for idolatry, a very different thing.

Fordham University, Molder of Men

E. P. TIVNAN, S.J., Ph.D.

President of the University

THREE-quarters of a century ago, on the occasion of Fordham's second commencement, the dean in his address to the graduates, reminded them that if the State invests a college "with discretionary power to decorate with these distinctions those whom we judge worthy, it expects and has a right to expect that they should show themselves on all occasions, in word and in deed, friends of law and order, defenders of truth and justice, supporters of sound morality."

The true object of education could not be expressed more concisely. Nor could the ideals for which Fordham has stood during seventy-nine years of service to Church and nation be more fittingly portrayed. Law and order became a catch-phrase on the lips of Americans in the reactionary excitement that followed fast upon the signing of the armistice. The present country-wide crime wave shows very clearly that a catch-phrase will not stem the tide of human passion nor cleave the line clear between liberty and license. Human actions pivot on motives, and law and order may be shouted from the housetops, until the crack of doom, but unless there be a motive for both, you will need a ring of steel to enforce them. And then what? You will have submission as long as you have force back of the police power of the State, but human wills are more lasting than steel

and when the break comes it is the steel that will break. The history of governments from Sparta to Prussia merely proves the superiority of will force over physical force. The nation is built upon will power, for the nation is built upon the individual.

And if I were asked to account for the fact that an institution can be successful in the educational field without rich endowment and can produce results in citizenship that are worth while, I would say that its educational power is commensurate to its will-molding power. It may not fill its students' minds with a mass of information, it may not offer courses to meet every line, especially the line of least resistance, but if it blends its educational ways and means into a coordinated system to reach the human will, it is bound to succeed. For it will mold men and on men are nations built. Of course its success will be limited. And this is the depressing thing to those who have America's best interests at heart. You may have the finest educational system, a system that has stood the test of time, and produced results that are measured in terms of loyal service to Church and State, and yet your success will be limited if your means are limited. Maybe this point can be made clear by a very simple statement. Fordham University began its career as a college in 1841 with an enrolment of thirty students. It has on its university rolls today more than 3000 students. If it had been an institution with a paid faculty, it would have been forced to close its doors some time very early in the year 1842, a very striking memorial to the need of money in educational life.

But as its faculty is in the main drawn from the Jesuit Order, there is no pay envelope due to the Jesuit teacher on the first of each month, and the college has grown, and developed because there has been no burden of faculty salaries to sustain. Computed on the basis of salaries paid by other institutions, the service contributed by Jesuit professors at Fordham in this year of the H. C. L. could not be purchased for less than \$150,000. The regrettable thing is that a faculty is only part of an educational plant. You may group men together who are so convinced of the value of their educational system that by a strange divine paradox they are willing to spend themselves in giving their system to the youth of the land and asking nothing in return for their giving. You will find in the quiet Fordham cemetery row after row of white crosses that mark the graves of Jesuit professors whose lives were spent in giving. But they form but a small proportion of all that has made up the life of Fordham's seventy-nine years. The larger proportion of college life is made up of students. The student body is not only dependent on the faculty but is dependent on equipment. You cannot have a college in an open field.

Faculty, student body, equipment; here you have all that makes up a college or university. For I take it that a system that aims at the complete development of the

complete man, intellectual, moral, physical is not liable to be the weak point in the various elements that go to make up university or college life. American educational theories have wandered far afield in the last few decades of our history for they have aimed at learning or information, forgetting that learning is an instrument of education and not the end of education. Character is the end, for without character you have no true ideal, and without ideals you have no citizenship worthy of the name. If learning were the end of education then our State prisons would not hold so many learned men, in fact they would hold no learned men. But you can have learning or a well-informed mind and an undeveloped will and the result is not an educated man in the true sense, the Catholic sense. Thinking men have been directing critical eyes toward American colleges, in fact toward the entire American educational system and asking if American business, social and political life is better because of the colleges of the land. It certainly should be better if the college functions properly, if it educates while informing.

Indeed the Catholic viewpoint of education is so insistent on will training, is so strong for the moral element in the educational curriculum that non-Catholic educators sometimes believe that we consider everything complete if religion is secure in our list of studies. While nothing is educationally complete without religion, it is false to suppose that our only concern in the educational field is religion. The growth and development of Fordham is refutation sufficient of such a false claim. From a small college of arts in the nineteenth century to the university with its graduate and under-graduate departments in the twentieth century certainly spells progress in the educational field. But the plain fact is that the growth has been difficult. As there has never been an endowment there have been severe financial strains. The medical school is about to be discontinued because it was found impossible to continue it and develop it without an endowment. Better no medical school than a school whose standard and existence would be precarious because of lack of funds.

It is a very practical problem that faces Fordham today. If the influence that she has wielded is to be in proportion to the growth of the Catholic population of the world's largest city, Fordham must build. More than 300 prospective students were turned from her doors last September because there was not room enough to receive them. Is Catholic higher education to be the privilege of the few or the opportunity of the many? The Catholic answer is and should be that higher education is for the many and not the few. For the greater number of educated Catholics the greater the sphere of Catholic influence in the land where opportunity opens to the hand of the educated. It would be a sad thing indeed if Fordham's growth were to stop because there was not enough appreciation in Catholic circles of the value of higher education.

National educational figures show that for every million of people there are enrolled approximately 2,000 college students. For every Catholic million there are enrolled approximately 950 students in Catholic schools. So the remaining 1,050 students needed to complete the average are enrolled in non-Catholic seats of learning. Along the eastern seaboard 6,000,000 Catholics have four major Catholic institutions in their midst. According to national figures these 6,000,000 Catholics furnish a student population of 12,000. According to Catholic figures there are actually 5,700 students in these colleges. So that one-half the Catholic students from this section of the country are attending non-Catholic schools. The Church is insisting on the Catholic collegian attending a Catholic college. The Catholic college because it is taxed to its capacity is turning the Catholic students away.

If Fordham is to meet the needs of the present, there must be expansion. Buildings are needed and needed urgently. A new dormitory is a necessity, a new science building and a new library and administration building

are necessary. And for the proper demands of physical training there should be a well equipped gymnasium. At present there is no gymnasium in the group of buildings on the Fordham campus.

To enable her to meet these needs, Fordham, for the first time in her history, is making an appeal to the public for support. She is really asking the people of this great city, if they think that her nine and seventy years of effort have been worth while. She asks them to aid her in training a body of citizens who will be such in every sense of the word. She asks them to safeguard themselves and their children and their homes by enabling her to raise up an army of men whose lives are dominated by right principles, men of character who will build up a strong public opinion and set it immovably against the onrushing spirit of lawlessness that threatens to sweep the world.

Fordham awaits the verdict of this city and State and the country, confident that the services rendered to all three will bring their reward.

English Opinion and the Irish Crisis

A. HILLIARD ATTERIDGE

I HOPE that Catholics in America will not be misled into attaching any importance whatever to the manifesto of the "Catholic Union of Great Britain" on Irish affairs. The Union does not represent anybody outside the small circle of its own members. It certainly does not represent the Catholics in Great Britain of Irish descent. And it represents only a very limited number of the English and Scotch Catholics.

Even as long as twenty years ago the Union was a "back number." It was first organized in Cardinal Manning's days and was then intended to be something like the Catholic Union of Germany, a rallying point for the Catholic laity in public work—social and political. The Bismarckian *Kulturkampf* was then in full operation and the Union did some good work in publishing reports on the situation in Germany. It proposed to take in hand the very useful business of registering the Catholic voters of Great Britain and seeing that as many as possible got their names on the voters' lists. I do not know how far this work was carried, but it was never completed and was soon dropped. Rumor said that the noble Lords and Conservative politicians who mustered strongly in the Union suddenly awoke to the fact that a register of Catholic voters would be mainly a register of the Irish vote in Great Britain, and that this vote was being fairly well looked after by the Irish National League. So the work came to an end. The Union however, in its earlier years, did some useful things, amongst them the preparation of a manual of the laws affecting Catho-

lics as such. But its activities became more and more intermittent. It crystallised into a limited body of conservative Catholic laymen, many of them titled folk, and the subscriptions were spent chiefly in keeping up an office and paying a salary to the late W. S. Lilly, who was its secretary for many years, and employed his leisure largely in high class Tory journalism. That the Union had failed to fulfill its early promise was made abundantly clear by the fact that Cardinal Vaughan found it advisable to establish the Catholic Federation to do the work originally assigned to the older society. The late Edward Lucas (the younger brother of the more famous Frederick Lucas) had a caustic turn of wit and used to describe the Union as the "Lilly Sustentation Fund," and its annual meetings as "the gathering around a table of a few eminent gentlemen who exchanged mutual congratulations on doing nothing in particular."

Of late years the Union has twice issued solemn pronouncements on Irish affairs, and on each occasion ventured to lecture the Irish bishops severely. The first of these escapades was in 1918, when the Bishops of Ireland placed themselves in the forefront of the resistance to conscription. The Union was shocked at their conduct and said so, assuming to speak in the name of the Catholics of England. A journalist friend of mine wrote to all the Catholic Bishops of England asking them what they thought of the Union's action. The war censorship prevented the publication of their replies in the press. They were almost unanimous in declaring that whatever

might be said for or against conscription in Ireland, the Union had no claim to represent English Catholic opinion on the subject and was guilty of gross impertinence in sitting in judgment on the Irish bishops. A Bishop of a great northern diocese wrote that among his people and clergy no one either knew or cared about the opinion of the Union.

Its latest pronouncement takes the form of a letter to Cardinal Mercier suggesting to him that the sympathy expressed by the Belgian episcopate for Ireland is ill bestowed, and the result of ignorance of what is happening in Ireland. The Union lectures two episcopates, the Belgian and the Irish. Cardinal Mercier has been informed of the true value of its claim to speak for the Catholics of Great Britain, and already two of the Catholic Bishops of England have publicly protested against its action.

I shall presently tell something of what is being done by Catholics in England to protest against the official terrorism in Ireland. First let me note the progress of a movement in which men of many beliefs and many parties are uniting, and in which Catholics are doing their part. A few weeks ago, in an article on the London funeral of the late Lord Mayor of Cork, I said that steps were being taken to organize a "Peace with Ireland Council" in London as a rallying point for the protest against the Black and Tan campaign. The Council came into existence in the beginning of November. The prime mover in the work and the chairman of the new group is Lord Henry Bentinck, M. P. The Bentincks came to England with William of Orange in 1688. The founder of the English line was William Bentinck, King William's fellow countryman, right hand man and confidential friend and helper both in war and diplomacy. The Dutch King of England made his Dutch friend Duke of Portland, and Lord Henry Bentinck is the brother of the Duke of today. With such an ancestry one would expect him to be a Tory champion of Orange Ulster. But although elected to the House of Commons as a Unionist he is a man of wide views, interested in social questions, anxious for a friendly settlement with Ireland and independent enough to break with mere party ties when he sees the party blundering. As a soldier, an ex-guardsman, with war services to his record, he can speak with authority on the military methods of the Government, but he is no militarist. He has denounced the Government policy in Ireland as "government by pogrom," i. e. organized massacre.

With him in the new Council there are associated many representative men, who, much as they may differ on other matters, are agreed that a stop must be put to the militarist coercion of Ireland, and as a means to this end are engaged in enlightening English public opinion on the subject. Among them are two famous Generals, Sir Frederick Maurice, who was Director of Military Operations on the General Staff in the great war, and Sir Hubert Gough, who was one of the army command-

ers. Gough was a cavalry colonel at the Curragh in 1914, and took a leading part in the military protest against armed action against Ulster. But since then he has left the Unionist ranks and become a vigorous supporter of self-government for Ireland. As he put it not long ago in a public utterance, he holds that practically all Irishmen have made up their minds that they must have self-government, and only differ as to the means of securing it, and he has gone so far as to declare that under certain conditions there is no reason why Ireland should not be a republic. The legal profession is represented on the Council by an ex-Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, Lord Buckmaster, Sir John Simon, a leader of the English bar, and Sir Frederick Pollock, the great authority on international law. Leading men of business are represented by Lord Leverhulme, George Cadbury and Seebohm Rowntree. The established Church of England has as representatives two bishops, a dean and a canon. Dr. Horton and Dr. Selbie represent the Nonconformist churches. Hilaire Belloc and the Hon. Everard Feilding (a brother of the Earl of Denbigh) are among the Catholic members. Literature, journalism and scholarship are further represented by G. K. Chesterton; the war correspondent, H. W. Nevinson (who has been doing splendid work in Ireland) and Professor Gilbert Murray. Mr. Annan Bryce, a brother of Lord Bryce and himself a witness of coercion methods in Ireland, is one of the treasurers of the Council.

It has sent to Ireland as its delegate, to keep touch with Irish opinion and report on the progress of events, a distinguished army officer, Lieutenant-General Sir Henry Lawson, K. C. B. It inaugurated a series of public meetings to educate English opinion by a great gathering on December 4 at the Albert Hall, the largest hall in London. Its huge amphitheatre gives room for ten thousand people, and it was crowded from floor to roof by an enthusiastic audience. Mr. Asquith was one of the speakers, but the event of the meeting was the speech of Miss Margaret Bondfield, a member of the British Labor party. Speaking as an Englishwoman, she protested that the coercion campaign was a danger and disgrace, not to Ireland, but to England and the British Empire, and that if English people only realized all its crimes and horrors they would fall on their knees to ask for the mercy of God.

The Labor party has done solidly useful work by sending to Ireland a group of its leading men as a Commission of Enquiry. Their report will be issued before this article reaches America. It will be a scathing indictment of the Government's methods.

The Catholic body held an important representative meeting at Caxton Hall, Westminster, on December 18. It was convened by the Catholic Women's Suffrage Society, and fourteen other Catholic organizations were represented on its platform. It was not a mere gathering of Irish sympathizers with Ireland. English Catholics

formed a large element in the meeting, and all the speakers except Joseph Devlin, M. P., were English. There were letters of adhesion from leading men, clerics and laymen all over the country. Cardinal Logue sent a message of encouragement. Amongst the letters of Englishmen the most notable were those of Bishop Cotter of Portsmouth, who wrote that if the Empire could be saved only by the methods employed in Ireland, it were better that it should perish; and the brief letter of Hilaire Belloc to the effect that Ireland does not want a truce, but wants the withdrawal of the "hired ruffians" who were committing murder and arson.

The chief event of the meeting was a lecture by Mrs. Crawford, Catholic member of the London County Council and a well-known social worker, who told her own experiences of the methods of these hired ruffians as she witnessed them during a recent tour in Ireland. She described the nightly raids of the Black and Tans, their lawless terrorism, the looting, insults, foul language and cruelty of the raiders. She told how in the houses of the poor they seemed to take a special delight in smashing pictures and objects of piety, crucifixes and holy images. She told the audience they might judge how these poor homes were treated by an instance of the reckless destruction carried out in better class homes. She had visited the house of a country gentleman near Tuam after a raid. The owner of it had during a long life made a wonderful collection of old "Waterford glass," which was kept in two large cabinets and was worth thousands of pounds. The Black and Tans took the glass out into the open air and smashed it to fragments. Mrs. Crawford saw the ground heaped and littered with the broken glass. She described as the Bishop of Galway had told it to her the murder of Father Griffin, lured out to his death by a fictitious message calling him to help a sick man. She told how, though the people around Tuam had injured no man, their town was sacked and there was a campaign of murder, arson, assaults and floggings throughout the district. She ended thus:

My visit to Ireland has opened my eyes to what England is really up against. It is the faith and patriotism of a whole people. All that is best and most spiritual in the people is in the Sinn Fein movement. We English think of the Irish as a vague, unpractical nation. In reality the Irishman is singularly clear-minded and logical, very like the French in intellect. All through the war we have shouted from the house tops the rights of small nations and we applauded Mr. Wilson's Fourteen Points that enshrined the principle. Today Ireland holds us to our bonds. She is determined that what is true for Belgium, for Armenia, for the Balkan States, shall also be true for her and she is revealing our hypocrisy to the world. England is in the position of a temperance orator who is found to be going to bed drunk every night. A man may be a temperance orator, or he may be a drunkard, but he cannot be both and ask for the esteem of a single honorable man.

Another English speaker, Mr. Grey, rising in the body of the hall, said that after residing for some months in Clare and seeing the horrors of the Black and Tan campaign he felt so strongly that he had come to England

to try to rouse the people to a protest. Another speaker read a letter from a well-known English author, a non-Catholic, now in Ireland, who wrote that he was astonished at the patient endurance of the Irish people, which he attributed to their strong religious faith, and like Mrs. Crawford he added that all that was best, purest and bravest in Ireland was on the side of the national movement. Joseph Devlin, M. P., rose, in response to a call for a speech, and told of the outrages on the Catholic workers of Belfast, and the burning of the convalescent home for Catholic girl workers at Bangor, County Down, erected at the cost of £20,000 collected by himself and his friends. "The police looked on," he said, "and the leader in the outrage publicly boasted of it and remained unpunished." He told the audience that the newspapers only recorded a part of the horrors inflicted on the people. Each week brought him fifty or sixty letters telling of these horrors and usually ending with a request that the writer's name should not be mentioned, as if it were published his life would not be safe.

We may take it, therefore, that at last English opinion is being educated and aroused on the Irish policy of the Government. The fact is that for a long time large numbers of people in England were incredulous about these horrors. Official denials gained credit because Englishmen found it hard to believe that policemen could behave like banditti, and that British officers and soldiers could be guilty of the outrages laid to their charge. And the official propaganda representing the Irish movement as the work of a murder gang found ready belief among people who knew nothing of Ireland. Now at last the truth is prevailing.

There is still much mystery about the truce negotiations in the first part of December. The offer from Galway County Council, of which the Government made dexterous use in order to represent the Irish as on the verge of surrender, appears to have been of less importance than was represented at the time. Of the thirty-two members of the County Council, only six were present at the meeting, and eight would have been required to make a quorum for a Council meeting, so the resolution was at best an expression of opinion by six individuals, who could not pledge the Council officially. There were several negotiators at work without any close connection between their efforts. They included the London correspondent of a Chicago paper; George Russell, of the Irish industrial group; Mr. Henderson, M. P., the Labor leader; and Archbishop Clune, of Perth, Western Australia, an Irishman from Bishop Fogarty's see of Killaloe. Archbishop Clune was introduced to Mr. Lloyd George by the Agent General of Western Australia and told the Premier how strongly men in the Australian Commonwealth felt on the question of Ireland. He urged the necessity of a negotiation between the Irish leaders and the British Government, but I gather that his proposals never took the form of suggesting a surrender of Irish claims. Mr. Lloyd George

seems to have been impressed by the interview and the Archbishop was allowed to go to Ireland and consult Arthur Griffith in prison. There was a second interview in London, at which Mr. Bonar Law and Mr. Lloyd George were present. The Premier seems to have been inclined to conciliation, but was overruled by the militant group in and outside the Cabinet. Popular report counts in this group Carson, Churchill and Sir Henry Wilson, now Chief of the Staff and virtual head of the army, and formerly a promoter of Carson's Volunteers.

Mr. Lloyd George's offer to negotiate with the Irish leaders and to arrange a meeting of Dail Eireann for this purpose was vitiated by being linked with the proclamation of martial law in Munster. A clever Australian caricaturist now working on the London press—Mr. Low of the *Star*—put the matter truly by giving us a picture of the Premier sending the dove of peace to Ireland carrying, not an olive branch, but a bomb. The authorities in Ireland had just published one of the most pitifully feeble orders ever issued to any military force. It was addressed to the new R. I. C., the Black and Tans, and begged them "not to embarrass the government" by further burnings. It was an admission of what the Government had so far denied, and a plea for moderation instead of a stern order to observe the ordinary discipline of a civilized armed force. It looks as if the Government cannot control its own agents.

Propaganda

LAWRENCE FLICK, JR.

AFTER two years, we find peace almost harder to bear than war, with this compensation, that the Church stands before the world in a new aspect, as the protector of the oppressed. To speak more exactly, the need of the time has led the Church to raise once more the voice of an authority never relinquished. When the Bishops warned all men, of whatsoever creed, that the worker must not be bludgeoned back into wage slavery, they were speaking as the Church always has dared to speak. But to those outside the Church it seemed a marvel that here should be the only authentic and authoritative voice raised in the workmen's defense. They marveled only because they did not know the inspiring story of ages of valiant warfare for the poor and the friendless.

The Bishops' utterance was but one of many acts, both during the Great War and since the signing of peace, which have caused those not of the Faith to view the Church as under a new and thought-arresting guise. Though it be as yet darkly and imperfectly, they begin to see her clothed in the majestic humanity which she wore in those ages of refulgent light, no longer called dark, when Christian justice and Christian charity infused all the relations of men.

That this should be so calls upon Catholics for far

more than mere self-congratulation. It is our opportunity to transmute the base metal of a brazen age into gold. Nor is this perhaps so hard a task as may appear. The desperate sins of the day, the crimes of violence and passion, the abandonment to pleasure, the reckless pursuit of wealth, are not so much proof of the world's utter depravity as of its utter unhappiness. Sin is perhaps as often a rebellion against circumstances as against God. These are days of change and seeking. It is for Catholics to shape the change to the symmetry of the Christian ideal, and to point out to the seekers that their unrest will find peace only in a social structure built on Christ's foundation. It is for Catholics to make Christ again an issue in everyday life. The Church, speaking through her anointed leaders, has sounded the onset. It is a glorious opportunity for the lay Catholic to take the Cross in a new Crusade, whose Holy Places are the hearts of all men!

Unluckily, we lay-Catholics are excellent deplorers. We yield to no one in deprecation of the world, the flesh and the devil. We do not give thanks to God that we are not like the rest of men; but we do rather wish to God that the rest of men were like us. We feel, and rightly, too, that if the spirit of the day were the spirit of Christ, our plagues would become blessings.

We like to warm our souls with this spirit of Christ. Now is the day and the hour to irradiate its saving heat upon the world. Why be miserly with a gift that increases as it is dispensed? Was there a term fixed by God upon His grace? Or a time limit placed upon the teaching mission of His Church? Did Christ say to His Apostles: "Go, therefore, teach all nations—for fifteen hundred years?"

This is the day for Catholic propaganda. This is the day when the Catholic spirit is the only influence potent enough to save the world. That spirit has become indispensable in all the great agencies that make public opinion and direct and govern private life. It is the only spirit that offers hope to either labor or capital. It is the spirit which must be infused into the theater and the motion picture, if these two most powerful shapers of minds and morals are to be made agents of good instead of panders of evil. It is the spirit that must be put to work in the news and magazine press, unless they are to remain sources of sensational misinformation and prurient scandal. It is the spirit that must set up a new concept of duty in the home and of the obligations of wifehood and motherhood. It is the spirit which must reform dress and remove the dangers from amusements.

To spread this spirit abroad in the world is an undertaking not unlike that which faced Ignatius when he raised his little army of fighting men whose daily prayer was combat. Perhaps there will be no modern Ignatius to fight the world to save it. But under whatever leadership, we have now in training a powerful and compact army capable of use in a struggle which must be largely intellectual. This is the body of students in Catholic

colleges. The battles of this lay crusade for the most part must be fought on paper. This is one of the cogent reasons why the layman must be the fighting man. The written word is the potent word. The priest's voice in the pulpit carries to hundreds at best. He preaches for fifteen minutes on a Sunday. The newspapers, the magazines, the "movies," preach to his parishioners by the hour seven days a week. For the hundreds who hear him on a Sunday there are thousands who hear him not at all. If in any measure we are to make the spirit of Christ the spirit of the world, the lay crusaders must be men trained to write. The new crusade must be preached in our Catholic colleges.

What a blazing shame it is, the waste of good literary talent that goes on year after year, in every Catholic school of higher education! A mute, inglorious Milton is not so sad a spectacle as a Milton whose tongue has been loosed and then is bound again after its first imperfect utterance. We are all fond of bewailing the evil days upon which literature has fallen. Read carefully any Catholic college magazine. You will find there lines of verse that have the ring of gold; sprightly essays whose phrases are turned with loving art; stories filled with that boyish spirit and imagination which is the principal hallmark of genius when retained and developed in manhood. You will be saddened when you reflect that of all the signatures you see there probably not one will ever appear on the title page of a volume or head story or article or poem in a magazine. A few of these brilliant tyros perhaps will rub off their lustre in the city room of a newspaper, writing what they are told to write in the way they are told to write it, growing shabbier in the habiliments of body and mind as the years pass.

Not long ago there died a priest and educator whose versatile genius was too little recognized. Among the many worthy things he did was to cause two volumes to be prepared and published by the boys of his classes. One of these was a translation of a part of the "Divina Comedia," which afterwards he produced on the stage. The other was a book of short stories, written as class exercises. In a foreword to the stories he said with justice that he believed they would not suffer if compared with much of the current short fiction. The volumes perhaps may still be found knocking about college libraries. They caused some comment at the time, more than a dozen years ago. The writer is familiar with the after-college careers of the men who took part in this literary exercise. Some of them are priests; a good many are lawyers; a few are in business; one is a newspaperman. None followed letters.

The secret of enlisting college men in a crusade of the pen is of course to interest them in practical results. There are boys in every Catholic college, and not few but many, who could be taught to write acceptably for newspapers and magazines. Of course they could not write on purely Catholic topics and hope to get their work published. But they could write on indifferent topics

in a Catholic way and score a big success. The newspapers and magazines, to cite one instance of demand, are hungry for little essays with a moral or philosophic turn. And Catholics, when it comes to bartering philosophies, are trading with good, hard money, fresh from the mint of truth, against a printing-press currency.

Every Catholic college readily could form a student organization whose literary output would leaven the lump of secular publications. Every Catholic college could hold together its alumni, trained in secular literary work during their college days, and make them a powerful instrument for influencing public opinion and elevating public morals. In every city there are young men in plenty, Catholics and for the most part graduates of Catholic colleges, who are engaged in newspaper work. They have had a practical training in nervous, forceful expression; they have kept their faith and their ideals; they know the lies and the cheap compromises of the day as a father confessor knows the hearts of his penitents; they only want direction to throw themselves into the fight, captains or privates, as they may be needed.

Following such a program, within a few years we could have trained and fighting in the forefront of the battle an army of literary crusaders unmatched in modern times. Its power for good would be incalculable. Its effectiveness would be reenforced by the present extraordinary condition of human society, desperately erring because desperately unhappy, and seeking a new Moses to lead it out of the house of bondage. It is an opportunity such as has not arisen since the old days of faith. It may never come again.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six hundred words

Girard College

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In the interesting article, "Catholic Representation in the Government," that Mr. George Barton contributed to your issue of January 8, occurs this sentence: "If I am not mistaken, through the cooperation of the Fathers of the Church of the Gesu, the Catholic boys (of Girard College, Philadelphia) are now enabled to receive their first Holy Communion and the Sacrament of Confirmation." Mr. Barton is mistaken, and as his statement is misleading I am sure he would wish it corrected.

Would that the hundreds of unfortunate Catholic orphans who, through no fault of their own, pass eight or more most impressionable years in that institution, which bars from its grounds even a priest with the Viaticum, were enabled to receive these two Sacraments. But the truth is a pitiful percentage of these Catholic orphans of Girard receive elementary catechetical instruction at the Gesu for six months. This yearly class varies in number from fifteen to twenty-five boys. No boy who has received these Sacraments may receive further instruction. As for the rest of the Catholic orphans, while they are at Girard College, they might as well be in Beloochistan for all the opportunity they have "to receive their first Holy Communion and the Sacrament of Confirmation."

Woodstock, Md.

NEIL BOYTON, S.J.

The Local Catholic Daily

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The articles in AMERICA on the Mexican policy of the Wilson administration, Monsignor Kelley's "Book of Red and Yellow," and Mrs. Nelson O'Shaughnessy's book, "A Diplomat's Wife in Mexico," had informed the newspaper man and had stirred him so deeply that he wished to share his knowledge, and his indignation, with others.

So it came about that he met first a Catholic politician who had vague and misleading notions about this matter, and soon thereafter met a Catholic professional man who had no knowledge of it whatsoever from the Catholic standpoint. He was not aware that the interests of the Church, the rights of his coreligionists, were involved.

These experiences set the newspaper man to thinking and to observing, and he found that many Catholic men were either uninformed or misinformed on this important subject. These included business and professional men, college graduates, men looked upon as leaders among the Catholics of their communities, men who occasionally gave addresses at gatherings of Catholics and were expected to voice the opinions of their fellow Catholics.

All of this strengthened the conviction the newspaper man had previously come to hold: that in this country we need an adequate Catholic press, which means a sufficient number of local Catholic daily newspapers.

The professional man admitted to the newspaper man that he read neither AMERICA nor *Extension Magazine*. He knew of the latter publication. Probably his wife read it. But he was too busy practising his profession to read anything more than the morning edition of a metropolitan daily, hurriedly in his office, and the evening daily of his home town, leisurely in the evening at his home.

So it was with many other Catholic men with whom the newspaper man discussed the situation as it was when Huerta and Pancho Villa and Carranza were actors in the tragedy of our southern neighbors. They knew nothing or little about the matter.

When the Smith-Towner bill came before Congress, the newspaper man, mindful of his experiences in connection with the Mexican situation, determined to make another series of experiments. He found that Catholic men in large numbers, men of whom he had a right to expect a knowledge of the bill and a lively interest in it, were uninformed or misinformed on the measure. Every Catholic publication in the United States was printing column upon column concerning the Smith-Towner bill. Yet there were many otherwise alert, progressive Catholics who were unaware of its significance, who had not been reached by any of these publications.

A prominent Catholic said to the newspaper man: "Let's see, wasn't that bill endorsed by an educational convention? It seems to me I read something to that effect. What's the objection to the bill?"

There were Catholic publications in this man's home. But investigation showed that he did not read them, because of lack of time, and lack of interest. His reading was confined to the daily newspaper of his home town. And he is representative of a large number of Catholics, of all classes, in all parts of our land.

Some people read the local daily because they have not time for more reading. Some read the local daily because they do not care for other reading. All read the local daily. In no other form has the printed word so many readers. The local daily is read because it carries the local, the home town appeal; because it tells the news not only of the nation and the world, but of the immediate community. Nothing can take its place, nothing can compete with it on even terms. It is a class by itself.

Of this is the newspaper man convinced: the only way in which the bulk of Catholics can be reached is by means of the

local daily in each community. It is the only efficient way in which there can be transmitted to them information of special interest and value to Catholics, but which cannot be conveyed by the pulpit or in any other manner. There is need, then, of catholicizing the average Catholic's local daily by establishing such a daily, or taking over one already existing, and putting it into the hands of men who are both newspaper men and Catholics. The Catholic local daily has become an imperative necessity.

Milwaukee.

ALBERT P. SCHIMBERG

The South, the Negro and the Truth

To the Editor of AMERICA:

On reading "The New Race Problem" in AMERICA for October 9, 1920, I concluded to take my pen in hand. Then I decided that, possibly, I was not called upon in the capacity of universal corrector. However, this same article has again been brought to my attention.

I am not acquainted with the writer nor with his degree of familiarity with the subject. But if I know anything about the Negro problem, as the result of long observation and much personal, first-hand information, the article is calculated to do much harm. Conditions in the far South make it absolutely unthinkable that the Negro be accorded either his so-called "political rights" under the Fifteenth Amendment, or the natural complement, his "right" to social equality. No matter what the law may be; no matter what the consequences may be, or what tremendous force, social, State or Federal, may be employed to suppress and crush him, the white man of the South will not submit to Negro domination. And Negro domination is precisely what Negro suffrage means.

The North too is now complaining about the Negro, and particularly about the Negro in the public schools where he is "co-educated" with white boys and girls. I recently spoke with the principal of a large school, situated in one of the border cities, in which, however, Northern sentiment has always prevailed. Formerly the whites were in the majority in this school. Recently, the Negroes have become more numerous. The principal tells me that as a result, conditions in this school are simply appalling. Morality and discipline have broken down. You now hear of riots in East St. Louis, in Washington, in Chicago, in Duluth, and elsewhere in the North, and more will follow. The Negro did not come back from France with a broader view of life; he came back from France with views that make law useless as a weapon of defense in the South, and it will take generations to separate him from those ideas. I have talked with intelligent colored men who agree with me, either that these ideas must be obliterated, or that the white race must be obliterated.

I am indeed surprised that Mr. Markoe puts the stamp of his approval on the *Crisis*. He says, "The organization (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) and its publication are militant, by some called radical, ask no favors, but demand full rights for American Negroes." Does he not know to how many evil things in the Negro the *Crisis* and its editor, Dr. DuBois, appeal? I am familiar with the *Crisis*, and I call it radical, I call it thoroughly disloyal, I call it seditious, and I call it absolutely pro-German and anti-American. During the war this publication was so disloyal, so seditious, so pro-Bolshevist and pro-German, and so pro-everything that might injure our country, that even the bureaucrats at Washington were afraid it had gone too far in one issue. For that one issue the mails were closed. If Dr. DuBois and the *Crisis* and his "gang" brook no compromise and ask no favors, he may as well know that neither does the Southern man. Let inhabitants of Minnesota remain at home to quell, if they can, the riots in Duluth, Minnesota, and the South will take care of itself.

Lexington, Kentucky.

B. L. S.

A M E R I C A

A · CATHOLIC · REVIEW · OF · THE · WEEK

SATURDAY, JANUARY 22, 1921

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSELEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 Europe, \$5.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Cheques for the American Committee for Relief in Ireland may be sent to the treasurer, J. J. Pulleyn, Emigrant Industrial Savings Bank, 51 Chambers St., New York, N. Y.

Dean West and the Smith Bill

DEAN ANDREW F. WEST of Princeton University recently withdrew from his cloistered calm to oppose at a meeting of the City Club in New York on January 12, the adoption of the Smith-Towner bill. An old-fashioned educator, devoted to the classics, Dean West is a vigorous schoolman, alive to every movement which promises improvement. He loves the things that time has tested, yet knows that progress is the law of life. But before he stamps progress with the seal of his approval, he wishes to assure himself that it is towards, and not away from, perfection. Hence it is not surprising that Dean West, a schoolman who stands for and exemplifies all that is best in American education, is strong in his opposition to the Smith-Towner bill.

From the argument that the United States should establish a ministry of education because foreign countries have done so, Dean West draws the opposite conclusion. Departments of Education in Europe, particularly in Bismarck-ridden Prussia and overcentralized France, have been "bitter things," largely used, in the opinion of Dean West, as instruments to corrupt the schools and to oppress the people. This conclusion, which Dr. Hadley of Yale and Dr. Hibben of Princeton have likewise reached, is fairly plain. Human nature and political schemes, the world over, are the same. Europe has actually tried the plan of a centralized education only to find that education is best administered by the people themselves and by local officers. Hence it is nothing less than astonishing that after a war fought for the destruction of tendencies to centralize governmental powers at the expense of the people, the most destructive of all such tendencies, next to the government control of religious forces, should be urged in the United States. Yet perhaps the most common argument advanced in favor of a Department of Education is the statement that in Europe education is controlled by the Government. That

very fact is an excellent reason why the United States should retain the traditional American policy according to which the Federal Government is absolutely forbidden to control, or meddle with, education within the States.

Under the American system of party government, it would be practically impossible to keep the schools from contact with partisan politics. "Who could guarantee," asks Dean West, "that the Secretary of Education would be appointed for his knowledge of the subject, and not as a political reward?" Not only would the head of the Department be a political appointee, but the Department itself would be coordinated with political officers in charge of State educational affairs. Crude in every detail, and utterly lacking any rational balanced educational program, the Smith-Towner bill reaches the acme of crudeness in the political machinery which it establishes. As Dean Burris of Cincinnati has well said, this bill creates on a national scale the political system from which progressive, well-managed cities for years have been striving to extricate themselves.

January 19, 1807

UNLIKE in ancestry, education and career, Abraham Lincoln and the great American whose birthday is celebrated on January 19, were brothers in their devotion to duty. The leader of the North, whose heart harbored malice toward none but charity for all, is not forgotten. Neither let us forget that the Lost Cause was hallowed in the leadership of Robert Edward Lee. For the war is over, the mists have lifted, and the clear light enshrines him, a knight without stain and without reproach.

"Duty," he wrote, "is the sublimest word in the language." Not fame, not victory, although he knew both, nor love, unless love is the bond that strengthens devotion to duty. Lee did not believe that secession was a State right under the Federal compact. But his allegiance was to his country, Virginia, and when Virginia called, he turned away from the offer to command the armies of the North, and drew his sword in defense of Southern Independence. "I did what my duty demanded. I could have taken no other course without dishonor. My only object is to repel the invaders of our peace and the spoilers of our homes." Even among those who regret what he did, who shall say that he was wrong? "If in all respects similarly situated," a generous son of Massachusetts, Charles Francis Adams, has said, "I hope I should have been filial enough and unselfish enough to have done as Lee did." Virginia was the home of his ancestors, the land of his birth. In Virginia he had learned to love his God and his country. Virginia had nurtured him and taught him; for Virginia, not the United States, had sent him to West Point, and there borne the expenses of his education. Duty bade him hear the call of his mother in affliction. Back to Virginia he went, this man who might have commanded a great army, to win distinction by performing

humble offices greatly, and to become the sublimest captain who ever unsheathed a spotless sword in the defense of a people's right to local self-government.

Few are the captains of the age whose inner lives will bear the searching light of history. Lee is one of the exceptions. Unsurpassed as a soldier, this true American was a man of simple child-like Faith. "Lee had but one intimate friend—God," writes Bradford of Massachusetts. His private and official correspondence, his bearing in victory and in affliction, his habit of daily fervent prayer, alike testify to Lee's trust in God and love of Him. No word of impropriety ever crossed his knightly lips. His life was as pure as the dreams of an innocent girl. Daily he besought Almighty God on his knees, to protect his country and to enlighten his enemies, and in the awful hours after Gettysburg, occupied externally with conducting one of the most masterly retreats in all history, he wrote:

I trust that a merciful God, our only hope and refuge, will not desert us in this hour of need, and will deliver us by His Almighty hand, that the whole world may recognize His power and all hearts be lifted up in adoration and praise of His unbounded loving kindness. We must, however, submit to His Almighty will, whatever it may be. May God guide and protect us all.

"In His own good time," he wrote in those bitter days when, like ravening wolves made mad by blood, professional patriots at Washington were devastating what was left of the South, "God will relieve us, and make all things work together unto good, if we give Him our love and place in Him all our trust." "I have a task," he told himself, "which I must now perform. I shall devote my life to training young men to do their duty in life." Duty was his light and his guide. But this great Christian soldier held that man's first duty was to God. Toiling as president of a small institution, he was anxious that his pupils progress in knowledge, but he believed that his work was a failure if every student at Washington College was not graduated with a new knowledge and love of Jesus Christ, and a fixed resolution to serve Him faithfully.

There is no nobler Christian figure in American history than Robert Edward Lee. May our young Americans who will carry on after we are dust, learn from the knightly soul of Lee that duty is holier than rights, and that man's supreme duty is to love God and to serve Him with deathless loyalty.

What Would Newman Say of Ireland Now?

IT might possibly cast at least a feeble ray of light into the minds of many an unimaginative Englishman of today who seems quite incapable of understanding why in the world the Irish have not completely lost their hearts long since to the invading Sassenach who has been for centuries exploiting and misgoverning Erin, if a certain striking passage from the writings of Cardinal Newman could be brought to these stolid

"Anglo-Saxons" attention. The page in question occurs at the beginning of a paper on "Northmen and Normans in England and Ireland," which the author contributed to the *Rambler* in 1859 while he was Rector of the Catholic University in Dublin, and it gives expression to the painful thoughts that cannot fail to have possessed the mind of so just, sensitive and high-minded an English gentleman as Newman. The learned, saintly Cardinal writes:

He [the English visitor] does not at first recollect, as he ought to recollect, that he comes among the Irish people as a representative of persons, and actions, and catastrophes, which it is not pleasant to any one to think about; that he is responsible for the deeds of his forefathers, and of his contemporary Parliaments and Executive; that he is one of a strong, unscrupulous and tyrannous race, standing up on the soil of the injured. He does not bear in mind that it is as easy to forget injuring as it is difficult to forget being injured. He does not admit, even in his imagination, the judgment and the sentence which the past history of Erin sternly pronounces upon him. He has to be recalled to himself, and to be taught by what he hears around him, that an Englishman has no right to open his heart, and indulge his honest affection towards the Irish race, as if nothing had happened between him and them. The voices, so full of blessings for their Maker and their own kindred, adopt a very different strain and cadence when the name of England is mentioned . . . one sentiment of hatred against the oppressor "*manet alta mente repostum*." The wrongs which England has inflicted are faithfully remembered; her services are viewed with incredulity or resentment; her name and fellowship are abominated; the news of her prosperity heard with disgust; the anticipation of her possible reverses nursed and cherished as the best of consolations. . . . It is as if the air rang with the old Jewish words, "O daughter of Babylon, blessed shall he be who shall repay thee as thou has paid to us!"

If resentment as deep and bitter as that just described rankled in the Irish hearts of 1859, it should not be too difficult even for an Englishman of Lloyd George's obtuseness to have a faint conception of what Ireland must think of the British invader in the present year of Erin's sorrows, when the English Labor Commission reports that "a thing is being done [in Ireland] in the name of Great Britain which must make her name stink in the nostrils of the whole world," and then charges the crown forces with murders, burnings, destruction, looting and floggings, "rough and brutal treatment of women [being] by no means the worst that has to be said against men in the service of the British crown." "Coercion is applied with such indiscriminate violence that the people are terror-stricken," attests Mr. Arthur Henderson, M. P. "It is actually safe to say that life was safer in Brussels during the German occupation than it is now in Cork, Dublin and Londonderry." The Hon. H. H. Asquith avers that "things are being done in Ireland by authority and incitement of the Executive which would take a fitting place in the blackest annals of the lowest despotism of the European world." And Mrs. Alice Stafford Green, the widow of John Richard Green, the English historian, in a merciless indictment of British "frightfulness" in Ireland which appeared in last week's

papers dwelt on the heritage of undying hatred Lloyd George's "firm measures" will reap for England. "What memories," asks Mrs. Green, "will hang about the refrain of 'God Save the King' for a child who has seen a father or a brother on his knees with a bayonet at his back or a revolver at his head made to sing that anthem." Though Newman gave a characteristically vivid description, in the passage cited above, of Ireland's feelings toward England in 1859, perhaps words would have failed even the great Cardinal, lord of language though he was, to express adequately what Erin thinks of Britain in the year 1921.

Obliging Censors

THE head of the Chicago police department has issued a "blanket order" to all exhibitors of moving-pictures. No picture may be used which shows the commission of a crime. "It will make no difference," the newspapers quote the chief, "whether or not the violator of the law is represented as a misunderstood hero or as an unmitigated villain, and it will make no difference whether or not these violators are finally shown as occupying prison cells."

This police-head, who issued his order as one means of checking crime, evidently has little faith in the judgment of a New York company of film-censors who style themselves a "National" board. His lack of faith is fully justified, and for two reasons. The first is that the committee in question is sustained as an organization by the contributions of the film-producers. The committee has frequently boasted that it had no connection whatever with the producers, but the fact is that for every film reviewed \$6.25 is paid by the producer. In the second place, the committee can order no changes made in any film reviewed, but must content itself with "recommendations." If the producer refuses to make these changes, the committee has no power to compel him to make any excisions. The value of any judgment passed by this committee is, therefore, several degrees worse than nothing. Worse, because of the general impression that the committee is a strictly impartial tribunal, its recorded judgment may be decidedly misleading. What the committee really is, was recently reported by an investigator of the Brooklyn *Eagle*, after an interview with the secretary:

"No member of our organization is connected with a motion-picture show," said the secretary.

"But," I said, "the pay for the upkeep of the organization comes from the motion-picture producers, does it not?"

"Yes," he said.

"And your policy?" I asked.

"Our policy," said he, "is to refer a questionable film to the manager and ask him to revise it."

"Did you revise 'The ——'?" I asked.

"We cut down the kissing-scene so it was not so long drawn out," he replied.

"But it is still there?"

"Yes," he said.

"Have you seen 'The ——'?" I asked.

"Yes."

"What do you think of it?"

"Well, our idea of such things," he said, "is to make a proper selection of proper pictures for the proper audience. What is proper for one audience may not be proper for another, you know. We reach our conclusions by a psychologic study of audiences."

He did not explain how a committee of psychological experts could follow in the wake of the motion-picture films and stop them at the psychologic moment when they became threatening.

Meanwhile, a film whose only appeal was "to the licentiousness and the beast in man," had been passed by this board of experts in psychology, and was being shown in New York.

Until a more effective censorship is devised, two points are suggested. First, protest to the manager of any moving-picture house where an improper picture is shown. If your protest is fruitless, let him know that he has lost a customer. Second, parents themselves should act as censors by permitting their children to view those pictures only which they know to be wholesome. Today, when moving-picture theatres are so numerous, even in our smallest cities, parents have few duties that are more serious.

A Policeman in Every Home

IT was recently reported by competent authority that cases of drunkenness had increased in the city of New York during the year 1920 by about 100 per cent. This fact does not prove that Prohibition cannot be enforced, but only that in the largest city in the world the first year of enforcement must be adjudged a failure. Neither incompetence nor dishonesty has been charged against the Federal officials, who complain that their staff of agents and detectives is far too small. The fault would therefore seem to lie at the door of Congress, which persistently refuses larger appropriations for suitable enforcement.

Doubtless local conditions present unique difficulties. While citizens of New York are law-abiding for the most part, the six or seven hundred thousand daily visitors to New York, or many of them, assume a changed ethical point of view with the new climate. Hence while petty disorders have probably decreased, major violations of the law have increased in the city. This seems true not only of New York, but of the country in general, and while it cannot be said that the Volstead act is the cause of this increase, all know what would have been said by the Anti-Saloon League had the Eighteenth Amendment been defeated. As a matter of fact, the clever "crook" and the intelligent malefactor, the men responsible for this country's criminal record, were never alcoholics, and many notable law-breakers were total abstainers. It is always difficult to enforce sumptuary legislation, and it may be that the Volstead act, as it now stands, cannot be enforced except by an army of police, detectives and pursuivants numerically comparable with the army that

defeated Germany. However that may be, the non-enforcement of the act is little short of an open scandal.

A new heaven and a new earth have not followed national Prohibition. Just as before January, 1920, so today, men who wish alcoholic liquors can obtain them if they have the price. The only difference is that today the man who purchases and transports to his home a case of innocent beer is a felon. Divorce goes on as before, the newspapers have never been at a loss for

scandalous stories, the stage continues to produce exhibitions which would have shocked Martial, discontent grows more ominous, and in violating the Volstead law thousands of hitherto law-abiding citizens are daily schooled in a contempt of law and order. Congress should either repeal or modify the Volstead act, or provide for energetic enforcement, even if that enforcement means a Federal policeman in every home in the United States.

Literature

"KING OF PREACHERS AND PREACHER OF KINGS"

LOUIS BOURDALOUE, "king of preachers and preacher of kings," is one of the glories of the Society of Jesus. His success in the pulpit is one of the most astonishing in the history of eloquence. For thirty-four years he was the first preacher in France, at a time when Fénelon, Fléchier, Massillon and Mascaron were recalling the accents of Greece and Rome, and Bossuet was reminding the world of the power and splendor of Augustine and Chrysostom. As an orator in the larger meaning of the term, Bourdaloue is inferior to Bossuet. As a preacher or "sermon-maker" he is the equal of the great Bishop of Meaux and superior to all those who during the seventeenth century in France formed a group of pulpit orators unique in history. When Bourdaloue appeared on the larger theater destined for his eloquence in Paris and at the court of Louis XIV, Bossuet had withdrawn from the pulpit and was seen there again but rarely, on those solemn occasions, for instance, when he pronounced the funeral orations of the Queen of England and the Prince de Condé. In 1669 when Bourdaloue came to the capital, he was in the full vigor of manhood, he was not yet forty, with mind and character formed under that stern discipline in which Ignatius of Loyola drills his soldiers. He had taught oratory, philosophy and moral theology, and though with rare exceptions he had strayed but little from his classroom and had preached in provincial towns only, he had picked up a singularly correct and sympathetic knowledge of men.

He came at the right time. France was at the height of its military and political glory. Art, literature and science were undergoing a new birth. A society and a court, the most brilliant perhaps the world has seen, intellectual, cultured, witty, pleasure-loving, corrupt even, but in spite of its vices, fundamentally attached to the old Faith, eager in the discussion of religious problems, were the main fields in which he was to labor. That court and society never received a more flattering compliment to its intellectual discernment, taste and culture, than the one it paid itself, when for so many years, it listened unwearied, nay charmed and in countless instances, with marked spiritual profit, to the manly and austere eloquence of that model Jesuit, Louis Bourdaloue. For all those years he preached the Gospel with a dignity, power and earnestness, a regnant and triumphant authority which stamp him one of the masters of human speech.

If good judgment, correct taste, a comprehensive grasp of his theme as a whole and in its parts, logical power, well-nigh exhaustless invention, orderly disposition, knowledge of the human heart, the gift of clear, concise, energetic and popular expression, coordination of all the faculties working to one noble end, form the orator, then Bourdaloue preeminently deserves that name. These gifts we claim for him in large measure, heaped

and running over. Yet we cannot claim for him one or two of the orator's highest gifts. Like Demosthenes, whom in almost everything else he resembles, like Chatham, like Bossuet and Vieira he does not wield the thunderbolt. Seldom from his lips do the listeners catch those trumpet calls, that lyric inspiration tingling close to the heart, which tell them that they are listening to a conqueror of men, a seer, a prophet that seems to hold their destinies in his hands. That one electric spark was denied Louis Bourdaloue. A wise Providence judged no doubt that this supreme gift would have made him too great. He has not the pathos, the passion, the lyric momentum of Bossuet, none of that irresistible power that brings the hearer to his knees in tears before the open graves of withered beauty, of exiled and fallen queens, or sweeps them into the sunlit heavens to contemplate the mysterious ways of Providence guiding the destinies of empires. Bossuet's eloquence is the march of a bannered host, sweeping from the portals of a Gothic cathedral to the conquest of a kingdom for the Cross, to the echoes of an organ's majestic harmonies, while standards wave and voices of mighty captains summon to the fray. The eloquence of Bourdaloue displays no such oriental pageantry. His sermons remind us of a Roman legion, setting out with the precision of a great machine, soberly, with measured tread and invincible, to carry order and law to the ends of the earth. Every detail of that engine of power has been thought out and adapted to the strategic scheme of the commander.

The sermons of Bourdaloue are about 150 in number, fewer than either those of Bossuet or Vieira, but nevertheless a remarkable output. Their general level is very high. With rare exceptions, in matter, workmanship, invention and execution, in solidity and reasonableness of doctrine and thought, in clarity and energy of expression, in practical application of general truths to the needs of the hearers, apostolic energy and vigor of attack on vice, in tenderness for the sinner, they are excellent throughout. Take up at random almost any one of the sermons, and you have in miniature a picture of Bourdaloue's eloquence. He is always sound, always rings true. One or two of the sermons, like the majestic sermon or rather triumphant hymn on the Passion of Christ, in which the orator proves that Christ Crucified is the Wisdom of God and the Power of God, derive a special interest and efficacy from their subject. But Bourdaloue brings the same powers to bear upon such a seemingly irresponsible subject as "Almsgiving," as he brings to that on the glories of Our Lord's Resurrection. No matter how dull the theme may appear, he delves so deep into its lodes and veins that he is sure to discover some precious gem. That uniform excellence never degenerates into monotony, because he has a lesson for his audience and adapts it to their condition and needs. He meets his hearers on their own level. He is one of the most practical of preachers.

Vigorous in dialectics, unsurpassed in logical sequence and

power Bourdaloue does not make a display of his gift. He skillfully wields all the weapons of his eloquence but never thinks of dazzling or bewildering his hearers. He does not seek to be eloquent. Sometimes, when it is evident that in his Roman-like and conquering tread, flowers will spring up under his footsteps, he seems deliberately to brush them out of his path, or to avoid them. For he does not wish to take an unfair advantage of his listeners, or to capture them by their emotions, to "steal away their hearts." To convince their minds he will not take them off their guard and convert them when they are hypnotized by dazzling pictures and sonorous words. We regret that the Jesuit does not more often use weapons that so readily take the heart prisoner but all acknowledge that he is a master in the use of those which he has chosen. When clad in the integrity of his own spotless life, he faces his audience, when with unerring accuracy he lays down principle after principle that cannot be gainsaid, and ever calm, master of himself and of the minds of his audience, he proceeds with unhurrying but irresistible march towards his goal, when he wraps his hearers round and round, with the steel-like bands of truth, which his writhing victim can neither elude nor break, he has a logic, a fire, a dramatic intensity absolutely original and seldom surpassed. He wrestles with his audience, he challenges its passions, unmasking them, shows their degraded features, exhibits their tyranny, and uncrowns these despots, so long the destroyers of his hearers' peace of soul and the unlawful tenants of their hearts.

Those hearts Bourdaloue knew thoroughly. He was a great practical psychologist. Absolutely unworldly, he knew the world as well as La Bruyère or La Rochefoucauld or Saint-Simon. He was the friend of all the great men of his age. From his quiet cell he had been dragged into the most dazzling of courts, seething with intrigues, and plots and tainted with an atmosphere of Oriental luxury. He walked unscathed amidst these Babylonian fires. But he was not unaware of the conflict of passions battling around him, and charted their changing tides. He knew his age, understood its grandeur and its weakness, and, without being dazzled or discouraged set about delivering in all its supernatural power his priestly message. With an apostolic freedom which some have denied him, he "thundered" against the misconduct of the king and warned him of the chastisements awaiting him, if he did not amend.

To his knowledge of the heart, of Scripture, of the Fathers, Bourdaloue, whose purpose was ever to convince the reason, adds an admirable oratorical strategy. He evolves his subject from a central idea. Under his touch it unfolds, not as in the sermons of Massillon with the luxuriance of a tropical flower, nor as in the discourses of Bossuet, with the majesty of the forest oak, but, vigorous, columnar like a mountain pine, whose roots strike down into a hardy but life-giving soil. Skilful strategist, he is also a practical tactician. For a Frenchman he is singularly calm. There is something of the imperturbable Foch about him. He does not charge upon the foe, pennants streaming to the wind, drums beating and all his heavy guns thundering at once, but calmly moves his forces to the attack, presses on over trench and redoubt, beats down the opposing squares, drives the enemy from every new position, until in despair that enemy hoists the white flag and surrenders, only to find his conqueror the most generous of friends, tenderly binding up his wounds and restoring him to life. Father Bourdaloue sought only to convince. His appeal was mainly to the reason. In this important duty of the orator he has seldom been surpassed. There lie his originality and his strength. For that reason his method commends itself greatly to our age. But while addressing himself to the reason, he won countless hearts. He preached Christ and His Gospel with dignity, rare authority and power. He was never afraid to tell monarch or courtier how to live. When granddaughters of kings, royal princes, victorious captains and

statesmen felt their last hour approach, they asked Louis Bourdaloue to instruct them how to die. No finer tribute could be paid to his eloquence and his sanctity.

JOHN C. REVILLE, S.J.

A HERMIT OF MAIN STREET

His heart is cloistered though around him fall
Clamors of Trade. He moves with Barter's brood
Attentive, yet high thoughts keep solitude
And peace where corridors of Traffic call.
Above the roads of Gain he knows a wall
Within whose sunny yard no darks intrude:
The hours of Thrift pass on; his evening mood
Sings with monastic bells of City Hall.

Awaited sounds! He takes his better heart
From Time's annoy; Eternity is fair
On night's horizons. Up a spirit stair
He mounts, and like a bee with certain art
That soars from poisons in a woodland mart,
Homeward he goes to golden cells of prayer.

MICHAEL EARLS, S.J.

REVIEWS

The Outline of History. Being a Plain History of Life and Mankind. By H. G. WELLS. Written with the advice and editorial help of Mr. ERNEST BORKER, Sir H. H. JOHNSTON, Sir E. RAY LANCASTER and PROFESSOR GILBERT MURRAY, and Illustrated by J. F. HORRABIN. In Two Volumes. New York. The Macmillan Co., \$10.50.

This is a history of the whole world, every bit of it, from the first clash of inanimate matter down to the last tangle of perverse man, all done into two volumes, in less than two years, with God thrown in by way of variety, but hardly from necessity. And, of course, the author is H. G. Wells who, at times, writes exquisitely and never with greater eloquence than when he is on uncertain ground, as he generally is in this latest work. A disciple of Huxley, Mr. Wells has never fully recovered from those materialistic prepossessions that invariably unfit men for serious scientific work. But be that as it may. As a historian Mr. Wells is a wretched failure. He is preoccupied with an *a priori* conclusion and occupied with the impossible task of trying to bolster up that conclusion with probabilities, hypotheses and theories that leave him just where he began, struggling pitifully with his materialistic conception of history. Like the kindred-minded McCabe, he jumps from assumption to certitude, from hypothesis to objective fact so readily that only the alert will catch him at the trick. Even when his facts are unimpeachable, his references are often awry, probably because the only life he knows is the life that somehow or other eventuates from the "clash of inanimate matter." For after all history is a philosophy of life, too, the story of man's relations to God and to his fellowmen and of God's relations to men in turn. And he who, like Mr. Wells, reads only the surface, interpreting it according to preconceived formulae is bound to fall short of both science and other reality, also. The man that figures on the Wellsian pages, is, of course, the child of an ape. The same old tiresome story is repeated and illustrated but not proved. *Pithecanthropus* appears in all the glory of apist hair, forehead, nose, mouth and teeth, made human-like by a deft touch here and there. And this, or some other brute like him, is apparently our great-great-grandfather, the creature who gave all of us life and started the human element in history. But everybody, except a few noted historians, knows that the sole basis for all this twaddle about *Pithecanthropus*, the sole foundation for the innumerable pictures of him, is a femur, two molar teeth, and a skull-cap, found

in the same strata in Java, but very far apart. And experts disagree violently about the relics: most admit that the femur is human, many declare the teeth an ape's; some think the cap man's, others deny this, other again believe it belongs to an intermediate creature and nobody knows anything certain about the remains, except, of course, Mr. Wells, who builds a philosophy of life on three old bones and presents it to the world with his *vos plaudite*. And *Pithecanthropus* was thrown over years ago by most reputable scientists!

In this connection a reference or two to illustrate Wells' knowledge and historical methods will not be out of place. In five short lines on page sixty-five he uses "may be" and "seems" in important conclusions and makes two misstatements of facts. History, with a vengeance! Immediately thereafter he plunges into an "almost certainly," where there is absolutely no trace of certainty, and then passes from a "conceivably"—a figment of his own brain—to another certainty, which is also mythical or worse. Who could not write such history? Worst of all, anthropology is not the only field of Mr. Wells' wanton gambols; the fair ground of geology is trampled also with desecrating feet. In other words, the author has absolutely no adequate scientific knowledge of his subject. He has picked the rags and tags of a discarded evolution from the refuse-heap of some laboratory, tricked them out in trousers and waistcoat and sent them abroad to attract popular attention. And sad to say his method is beneath contempt, as witness his treatment of *Homo Neanderthalensis*.

This is all very unsatisfactory, but Mr. Wells' treatment of religion is no better. In the first place he does not know the Christian creed, yet he writes about it, as if he were another Thomas Aquinas in scholarship and power of analysis. Just as he missed the central fact of history, so he misses the central fact of Christianity, and thus becomes a polite, but perhaps unintentional blasphemer under the inspiration of German pseudo-higher-critics whom he once professed to despise. His chapter on the "Beginnings of Christianity" is childish in the extreme. In one sentence he accepts Scriptural evidence and in the next rejects Scriptural evidence, apparently for the sole reason that it does not fit in with his prepossessions. Thus he becomes the author of a *farrago libelli* that is worthy of the scorn of a Juvenal. And yet the book will deceive many people and then it will die.

R. H. T.

Political Systems in Transition. By CHARLES G. FENWICK. New York: The Century Company. \$3.00.

Professor Fenwick's book is an interesting volume giving in compendious form a clear, accurate account of the modifications in their political systems through which the great countries of the world passed in the process of adjusting themselves to the requirements of war, and through which they are still passing in their more or less tentative efforts to satisfy the insistent demands for a fuller participation in the fruits and ideals of democracy. The treatment of the autocratic and democratic institutions in Europe, with the passing of the former and the changes in the latter, while sufficiently extended to give the reader a limited knowledge of the systems in question, both in their period of transition and in their state of survival, is much more summary than that given to the Government of the United States, and is to a large extent made to provide points of contrast and comparison for a fuller understanding of the logic and necessity of the departure on the part of the American Government from the normal processes of peace to those of war, which was rendered inevitable by our participation in the great struggle for the liberty of the world. There are some excellent chapters on the new ideals of democracy, on the program of political reconstruction and on international reconstruction.

Aside from the enormous labor involved in getting together

so large a mass of accurate information, in sorting out the essential from the accidental, and in presenting apparently unrelated facts so as to make them throw light one on the other, the chief recommendation of the book is its objective character. Throughout the author has maintained a strictly impartial attitude, contenting himself with writing a history, not of military operations, but of the trend of events at home. Nowhere does he let subjective prepossessions obscure his steady vision of facts. Even in his discussion of the vexed problems involved in the further readjustment which must be completed before the period of transition is ended, he keeps his personal sympathies constantly in check, and views the future not merely in the light of present conflicting tendencies but also from the viewpoint of an acknowledged expert in the history of political institutions both at home and abroad. Writing as he did months before the November elections and the somewhat unsatisfactory meeting of the League of Nations held recently at Geneva, he is, perhaps, a little too optimistic about the efficiency of the covenant as an instrument for rescuing the world from what he calls its present international anarchy, but no one who reads his last chapter is likely to dispute his contention that some scheme must be adopted for providing a meeting-place for the representatives of the nations where the forces which in different countries seek the same ideals may be directed to their common purpose, and where legal validity may be given to organized public opinion.

J. H. F.

The Story of the American Red Cross in Italy. By CHARLES M. BAKEWELL. New York: The Macmillan Co. \$2.00.

Shadow-Shapes, The Journal of a Wounded Woman, October, 1918-May, 1919. By ELIZABETH SHEPLEY SERGEANT. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. \$2.00.

The dispassionate account of the work of the American Red Cross in Italy reads like a romance. Mr. Bakewell has combined a survey of activities with a vital sketch of the needs that induced them. The first chapters give a brief account of Italy's entrance into the war, of the defeat at Caporetto and all that followed, and of the establishment of the Red Cross Commission in Rome. Then we read of the work accomplished, of soup kitchens dispensing an average of 30,000 rations a day, of thousands of children helped through a multitude of hospitals, schools and day nurseries, of tons of hospital supplies provided and millions of cans of milk, of rolling canteens and ambulance service, of relief trips to the peaks of the Alps, and of regular work among our own troops. The book closes with ten appendices giving statistics of expenditures and the name of all connected with the work. The Red Cross cooperated wherever possible with existing institutions, and as often as not these were in charge of energetic young priests and efficient Sisters. The Pope is mentioned once and his neutrality vindicated. The writer pays the highest tribute to what the Italians themselves accomplished, speaking of the share of the American Red Cross as comparatively insignificant. Throughout we feel Mr. Bakewell's appreciation and respect for the fine qualities of the people.

A journalist representing the *New Republic* going for a drive to the American battlefields of the Marne was accidentally wounded by a bursting hand grenade, and we have "Shadow-Shapes." Artists have a trick of holding a mirror before their paintings to determine the values more accurately. In the mirror of this artist's mind we see reflected all the events of the memorable months during which she lay upon her back in hospital. Her friends came to her,—French, American, British men and women, in and out of the service,—and gave her their separate tales of the great events in which she could have no part. All these she reflects for us, and we have a picture of Armistice Day, of the expectation and the coming of President Wilson, of the heart of Paris as it beat and swayed during those perilous great days. There is another value in the book in its

poignant description of all the author herself endured as one of the great army of the wounded.

A. F. K.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

A Valuable "Mind."—The contents of the *Catholic Mind* for January 22 make it a notable number. Archbishop Hayes' appeal for Peter's pence on the eve of his departure for a visit to the Threshold of the Apostles gave his Grace a fit occasion to pay a fine "Tribute to Pope Benedict XV" which opens the current number of the fortnightly. The Archbishop reminds his flock of their happiness in being united in oneness of faith at the feet of Blessed Peter's Successor, he then recalls the exalted position the Holy Father held during the World War as the promoter of works of mercy and peace among all the combatants and shows how varied, munificent and far-reaching Pope Benedict's relief-measures were. The second article in the issue is an excellent paper on "Religion in Social Service" by the Rt. Rev. William Turner, D.D., Bishop of Buffalo. In a speech delivered last December at a social-welfare conference the author conclusively proved that religion, far from being a hindrance to scientific and effective charitable work, is the greatest of helps, supplying motives and imparting a spirit that can come from no other source. Social workers of every creed should read Bishop Turner's paper. Then follows Terence MacSwiney's renowned "Inaugural Address" which will doubtless take its place in the annals of Ireland alongside Robert Emmet's famous speech. The Catholic Faith of the late Mayor of Cork shines out in the address as splendidly as does his fearless patriotism. "It is not those who can inflict the most, but those who can suffer the most, who will conquer," he said. The number ends with a short article on "Catholicism, the Only True Religion."

Vitalism and Scholasticism.—Sir Betram Windle has done an excellent work in giving "Vitalism and Scholasticism" (Herder, \$3.00) to the press, if, for no other reason, because he has set before the public a simple, scholarly book that can be easily understood even by those untrained in scholasticism, biology and the allied sciences. The subject is old, but the treatment of it new and refreshing. The first chapter sketches the rise and fall and resurrection of vitalism, and the rest of the book is taken up with scientific data connected with this subject. Professor Windle submits the data to an incisive illuminating analysis, only to conclude, as did many scientists before him, the impossibility of escaping the conclusion that in all living creatures there is a vital principle from which flow the phenomena that distinguish living from non-living creatures. The book is another clever blow at materialism, and it is to be hoped that the author of this book will follow up his victory by still another volume in which the positive element of scholasticism stands out more prominently. He is, perhaps, in a better position to do this than any other scientist of the English-speaking world. For added to the prestige of a great name and thorough acquaintance with the subject, he possesses the ready faculty of discussing intricate problems simply and clearly. Perhaps Professor Windle will do for scholasticism what Haeckel tried to do for monism.

The Roman Catacombs.—The Rev. A. Henderson, the Anglican Vicar of St. John de Sepulchre, Norwich, England, by bringing out his excellent little book "The Lesson of the Catacombs" (Macmillan) is helping his Protestant parishioners and readers to take another step toward Rome, though that may not be his intention. From his own study of the Catacombs and from his familiarity with the works of De Rossi, Marucchi, Northcote, and Edmundson, Mr. Henderson is able to describe accurately many of the symbols and inscriptions to be found in the 600 miles of subterranean cemeteries that lie beneath the Eternal

City and its environs, and he is Catholic-minded enough to write with devout enthusiasm about the true significance of the words and figures to be seen in the Catacombs. The author first describes the nature of these early Christian burial places, attests that some inscriptions to be read there prove beyond all reasonable doubt that St. Peter died in Rome and devotes chapters to the Catacombs' striking testimonies to the purpose and nature of Baptism, Confirmation and the Holy Eucharist. He ends with some beautiful pages on the Communion of Saints as it is preached from walls bearing such inscriptions as "Ye Holy Martyrs, be mindful of Mary"; "On the 31 May, Pretiosa fell asleep, a little maid just 12 years old—God's maid and Christ's"; "Here lies Dionysius, an innocent little boy: Be mindful of us in thy holy prayers"; "Eternal light be Thine, Timothea, in Christ." Particularly interesting are the pages describing how the Holy Eucharist is sometimes symbolized in the Catacombs as a Pail of Milk. There are adequate illustrations.

St. Bernard's St. Malachy.—The Rev. H. J. Lawlor, D.D., Litt.D., an Anglican minister, has translated into good English "St. Bernard of Clairvaux's Life of St. Malachy of Armagh" (Macmillan), written a good introduction and furnished the text with learned notes. But he has turned all St. Bernard's quotations from the Vulgate into the English of the King James Bible, an incomplete, unauthorized version of the Sacred Scriptures of which the two Saints certainly would have disapproved. The great twelfth-century Cistercian, as is well known, was a warm friend of Erin's zealous Primate who foretold that he would end his days at Clairvaux on All Souls' and so it came to pass. For St. Malachy was on his way to Rome to receive the pallium from Pope Eugenius, and broke his journey at St. Bernard's Abbey, "when lo, on the feast of Blessed Luke the Evangelist," as his affectionate biographer, relates, "when he had celebrated Mass in the convent with that holy devotion of his, he was taken with a fever. . . . He was anointed and when he had received the viaticum he commended himself to the prayers of the brothers," and on November 2, 1148, "Malachy the Bishop and Legate of the Holy Apostolic See, taken up by the angels as it were, from our hands, happily fell asleep in the Lord." As St. Malachy cannot but be keenly interested still in the faithful flock he once shepherded so well, both his own strong prayers and those of his renowned biographer are surely being offered now for sorrowing Ireland.

Who's Who.—"The Catholic Who's Who and Year Book for 1921" (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 5s), makes interesting reading. From Miss Alice Abadam, worker for the political enfranchisement of women, to Father Francis de Zulueta, S. J., author of the popular "Lectures on Catholic Doctrine" and composer of Church music, this miniature encyclopedia of biography brings before us a muster roll of Catholics who have distinguished themselves in the service of Church and State in the British Isles. In every walk of life, as can be seen from its pages, as writers, statesmen, soldiers, sailors, poets, lecturers, painters, actors and polo-players, Catholics are doing their share and no small one in carrying the burdens of the society in which they live. The late Sir F. C. Burnand, who founded the "Who's Who" has had an able successor in the editor of the present number, who has made a wide survey of the field of Catholic activities and brought together in brief but meaty notices the "works and miracles" of many in the fold, whose substantial accomplishments would otherwise remain unknown. The names of a few prominent Catholics in the United States have been added to the list. It is to be hoped that in some future edition, the name of Gilbert Keith Chesterton may be found in the niche which it would admirably fill, and to which it seems naturally to belong.

EDUCATION

The Unamendable Smith Bill

ON the morning of January 12, the Associated Press dispatches announced a message from the Hon. Horace Mann Towner, a representative from Iowa, and coauthor of the Smith-Towner bill. The import of this message was that having the fear of God before his hitherto blinded eyes Judge Towner had begun to walk the path of educational righteousness, the first step being a reform of his bill for the establishment of a Federal dictatorship over the schools of the respective States. Now one always wishes to hang out the lamp for the return of the sinner, and my first thought was to order, not a flickering tallow, but a whole battery of searchlights, hoping thereby to aid Judge Towner to tread the unaccustomed ways, head up and with steady pace. To my surprise, the blaze of light discovered the venerable jurist and legislator proceeding counter-moth-wise, *i.e.*, not toward but away from the light, and not so much walking as progressing at a gait which might be described as a gallop, and straight into the darkness at that. For Judge Towner has not reformed his bill at all, much less reformed it altogether. He has but offered a few amendments.

THE SAME OLD BILL

NOW amendments to the Smith-Towner bill are fully as useful as a celluloid chafing-dish. Unless, like Hilaire Belloc's antecedent notion of the Ambrosian rite, these amendments preface "nots" to every positive statement, remove from them every negative, substitute curses for blessings and replace benedictions by anathemas, they are wholly useless. Thus an amendment that is an amendment might thus affect the very title of the bill, as follows: "A BILL not to create a Department of Education, not to authorize appropriations for the conduct of said non-existent Department, not to authorize the appropriation of money" and the rest. These most significant "nots" at once put us on the trail of an excellent plan; namely, to bring the Bureau of Education back to the light of other days, when it used no time at all in lobbying for pending legislation and by consequence devoted its energies in compiling really useful and frequently valuable statistics and reports upon matters affecting education rather than politics. In like manner, a real as opposed to a fictitious amendment would cause line 7, section 1, to read, "a Secretary . . . who shall NOT receive a salary of \$12,000 per annum," and would make the heart of the bill, section 7, to flutter and quit in the following change, "there is hereby NOT authorized to be appropriated . . . and annually thereafter, \$100,000,000." For the Smith-Towner bill is not loved for the beauty of its face, or admired for the grandeur of its intellect, but appreciated only for the size of its bank account. Cut out the heart of the bill by refusing this huge annual appropriation, and it will have not even one friend to weep at its bier.

Amendments authorizing no Department of Education at all, and cutting off all appropriations, would effect an essential change in the bill. But any amendment consistent with the creation of a Federal Department, having power to enforce its decrees by the annual distribution of sums in excess of \$100,000,000, leaves the Smith-Towner precisely what it has always been: an un-American, unconstitutional, bureaucratic device, imported to impose upon the schools of this country a political control which today is discredited even in Prussia. And that is precisely what the Smith-Towner bill is, even after Judge Towner's tinkering amendments.

FEDERAL SUBSIDIES MEAN FEDERAL CONTROL

WHAT the Federal Government subsidizes, the Federal Government controls, root and branch, lock, stock and barrel. To say that the Federal Government can distribute money among the States for education, or for any other purpose, without controlling that purpose is to qualify for the care of the alienist. It is now claimed that the Towner amendments

forever prevent anything like Federal control of the Federal money distributed by the Federal Secretary to the local schools. The "only" power given the Secretary, it is said, is to judge whether or not the States use the money for the purposes for which it was appropriated. (Section 14, lines 6, 7, 8, H. R. No. 7.)

"Only" here means "all," "complete." When the Federal Government appropriates money for a bridge or a dam, it cannot accept a battleship or an automobile. The "only" control exercised by the Federal official letting the contract or conducting the work, is to judge whether or not the money is being spent for the purposes for which appropriated. If the Federal Government appropriates money to fight the boll-weevil in cotton or the foot-and-mouth disease in cattle, it will not accept an exhaustive report on the blight in peaches or the plague in India. The Federal official in charge has no control whatever over the bridge-builders or the engineers or the contractors or the entomologists or the veterinarians except to see that they work for the definite purpose for which the Federal money was appropriated. He cannot have any lesser control, and he needs no greater, for his control is complete. Complete control is inevitable. For the Federal Government cannot give away money, or allow appropriations to be used in any manner, but only in accordance with the specific purpose for which the grant was made. Further, as to the propriety of use, the Federal Government is the supreme judge.

EDUCATION NO EXCEPTION

NOW the specific purpose for which money is appropriated under the Smith-Towner bill is the building up, and general equalizing in all the States, of the educational facilities of the country. That purpose will and must be controlled by the Federal Government precisely in the same manner in which every other Federal appropriation is controlled by the Federal Government. As Congressman Fess, a warm friend of the bill, said some months ago, "We want to avoid Federal control of education, but that, precisely, is what a Federal appropriation means." In express terms the bill still directs the Secretary "to insure that all funds . . . shall be used for the purpose for which they are appropriated." The "purposes of this act" embrace the complete school economy of the State systems, from the teaching of children and adult immigrants to the preparation of teachers and the improvement of teachers already in service, from the promotion of "Americanization" to instruction on "the duties of citizenship in a free country"; and the purposes of this act must necessarily be enforced by a Federal Secretary whose decisions prevail through his power to distribute or withhold the annual sum of \$100,000,000. Whenever Federal funds are granted for any of these purposes, a political appointee, the Federal Secretary, will be empowered to rule on them, rating the schools as to their fitness to continue in the Federal appropriation, examining whether or not the schools are teaching in a fit manner the common branches or, most dangerous of all powers to confer upon a Federal official, deciding what is to be taught under the title, "Duties of citizenship in a free country." The amendment to section 14 is practically of no avail, since the Federal Secretary alone still decides whether or not "the courses of study, plan and methods" determined by "State and the local authorities" are in accord with "the purposes" of the Federal act.

Mr. Towner might as well present amendments abolishing the solar system. After all his tinkering, we have the same old bill to establish Federal control of the local schools. We cannot make nitroglycerine safe to handle by dropping the first two syllables. We cannot establish a Department of Education, giving a Secretary power to distribute a Federal fund in excess of hundreds of millions, without utterly destroying that local control of the schools which the framers of the Constitution held to be among the most vital of the rights forbidden to the Federal Government and reserved exclusively to the people.

DR. KINLEY AND THE BILL

IT is a relief to turn from the sophisms of Judge Towner to the strong and simple denunciation of his bill, made by Dr. David Kinley, president of the University of Illinois. Dr. Kinley is thus reported by the Chicago *Evening Post* for January 11:

This Federal-State plan is known in educational circles as "the fifty-fifty plan." It is strange to me that so many people, even in a State like Illinois, have regarded it as beneficent. The Federal Government takes a dollar from Illinois, returns perhaps twenty cents of it, on condition that Illinois will furnish another twenty cents, and then permits the agents of the Federal Government a thousand miles away to tell her what to teach her children and how to teach it.

The present tendency in all this legislation is likely to destroy that system of checks and balances which is the very essence of our form of government. We are drifting toward a political system which will lodge authority in practically all matters of public importance in the hands of the Federal Government, and leave the States themselves and many of the communities in the States, dependent upon action from Washington, and powerless to do otherwise, because the Federal Government will have taken all the means at hand to do the things in question.

[This drifting] not only tends to produce disrespect of law, but it continually weakens the sense of duty and responsibility of the individual citizen. A long continuance of such a process will result in time in imposing on the people, even of a democracy, governmental and bureaucratic control over a large part of their lives and actions.

Undoubtedly, the most pernicious single factor now at work to "impose governmental and bureaucratic control" upon the people of the United States, is the Smith-Towner bill destroying freedom of education, a constitutional right fully as important as freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

SOCIOLOGY

The Communist International in the United States

ENTERING a residence in one of our western cities on a rainy day I picked up from the wet pavement before the door a stray sheet of paper, drenched with the December showers. The heading had attracted my attention and I carefully folded the closely printed page and stowed it away in my pocket for future perusal. Opening it later I discovered it to be a statement issued by the Executive Committee of the Communist International, through its American Section, the United Communist Party. It was an appeal to American Socialists, and the title which had first attracted my notice read: "The Communist International to the American Socialist Party."

The document, authorized in Russia by Lenine's committee, was written in a strong nervous style, by a man who was master of English, and knew well how to scourge with scorpions the leaders of American Socialism, whom, from his point of view, he regarded as reactionaries and traitors, still looking to parliamentary methods in place of mass-action, and the promotion of merciless civil war. Particular objects of his contempt were such men as Hillquit, Berger, Lee, Meyer London and the district attorney of Milwaukee, whose heinous crime was that he "imprisoned workingmen for breaking up a religious meeting." Comrade Debs, indeed, was given credit for a fine revolutionary record, but all the more shame, the document added, to those would-be Socialistic leaders who in nominating him for President had merely exploited him for their own "non-revolutionary" purposes, "at the same time refusing to consider Comrade Debs' proposal for unity with the Communists."

MOSCOW COMMUNISM AND AMERICAN SOCIALISM.

YET the Socialist party had in no uncertain way expressed its sympathy with the Russian Communists and with the Soviet Government. Its official organ, the New York *Call*,

had glorified every phase of Bolshevism and apotheosized its leaders. American Socialism had even eagerly sought to cast itself into the arms of the Moscow or Third International. In the referendum, completed January, 1920, the rank and file of the American Socialist party voted to join that body, though the national convention split upon this issue, the irreconcilables forming the United Communist party. Yet the convention, too, declared: "We, the organized Socialists of America, pledge our support to the revolutionary workers of Russia in the maintenance of their Soviet Government." (September, 1919.)

But the Lenine Communists were not satisfied with such political statements as that contained in the "Brief for the Socialist Assemblymen" where it was said:

We sympathize with the Russian workers, the Russian peasants, the Russian Socialists, the Russian Communists, in maintaining their Soviet Government—not because it is a Soviet government, but because it is a government of their own choosing. Suppose they had adopted a different form of government, say one that had sprung from the Constituent Assembly, we should not support it any the less.

Indefensible as this sympathy with a government based upon murder, intolerance, irreligion, and the absolute dictatorship of a godless bureaucracy must be to any worker inspired with sentiments of Christianity, and with the true ideals of democracy, it could not but arouse equal indignation in the hearts of the Communists who will hear of nothing less than absolute control of all the world by their own International. Tolerance for any other form of government is to them a bourgeois compromise, a social heresy and treason. They resented no less, therefore, the report adopted in the 1919 convention of the American Socialist party from which we have quoted above, since it contained the following explanation:

The Socialist party of the United States, therefore, declares itself in support of the Third (Moscow) International, not so much because it supports the Moscow programs and methods, but because: (a) Moscow is doing something that is really challenging to world imperialism. (b) Moscow is threatened by the combined capitalist forces of the world simply because it is proletarian. (c) Under these circumstances, whatever we may have to say to Moscow afterwards, it is the duty of Socialists to stand by it now, because its fall will mean the fall of Socialist republics in Europe, and also the disappearance of Socialist hopes for years to come.

To this the Communists answer haughtily that they are not a Moscow party, but a centralized and disciplined organization now comprising the great majority of the revolutionary working class parties of the world, and that they are not holding a defensive position against capitalism: "The Communist International is in no sense a defensive organization. It is an organ of aggression, the general staff of the world revolution, for the forcible overthrow of the capitalist State everywhere, and the setting up of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

SOCIALISM CAPITULATES TO THE INTERNATIONAL.

IN all this the American Communists are perfectly accurate in their statement, as also when they add that the Second Congress contained representatives of the revolutionary vanguard of practically all countries. They are not so much asking the Socialist leaders of various lands to come to them, as setting the strictest and even the most humiliating conditions for the reception of such candidates. These leaders, Americans as well as others, the Communists claim, now come to beg for admission into the International, not through their own initiative, but "pushed onward by pressure of the masses." Following the adoption of the minority resolution by the American Socialist party, in 1919, official application was actually made by it, through Otto Branstetter, national executive secretary, March 18, 1920, for membership in Lenine's and Trotzky's Communist International. Almost everywhere, indeed, the Socialist

parties of the world to a large extent capitulated to Bolshevism, even when they would not accept the terms set for them by Lenine. "There are still many prominent anti-Bolshevist Socialists in all countries," wrote Walling in 1920, "but they have been reduced to dwindling minorities on the entire continent of Europe."

PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

WHAT the Communist International definitely demands of all parties that seek admission into its camp is thus clearly set forth in the official document before us, issued by the important Executive Committee itself of the Communist International, through its American section, known as the United Communist party:

The Communist International is not a hotel, where travelers may come with their own baggage and carry on their private affairs. The Communist International is an army in wartime; volunteers who join the army of revolution must adopt its principles and obey its orders, submit to its discipline.

None but revolutionary Communist parties are accepted in the Communist International. They must adopt as their program the program of the Communist International—open revolutionary mass-struggle for Communism, through the dictatorship of the proletariat, by means of the workers Soviets—accepting as binding all resolutions of the congresses and executive committees of the Communist International. They must create a strong centralized form of organization, a military discipline; *all party members in public office, in the labor unions, in all forms of public activity, must be absolutely subject to the full-powered central committee of the party*, which is the supreme organ directing all the phases of party work.

They must consistently denounce bourgeois democracy and social patriotism, and also the falsehood and hypocrisy of social pacifism; they must systematically demonstrate to the workers that without a revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist state no talk of disarmament, no international arbitration, no League of Nations can save mankind from imperialist wars.

They must immediately break with reformism and the policy of the centrists; they must expel from their ranks all non-revolutionary elements, all opportunist leaders; they must sever all connection with the petty bourgeoisie and prepare for revolutionary action, *for merciless civil war*.

This is the Communist program as it is drawn up, not for the United States alone by the Executive Committee of the Communist International, but for all the world, for every country under the sun, wherever Lenine's agents are at work.

THE COMMUNIST IDEAL

THE Communist International is therefore a thoroughly organized system, based upon the principle of strict military obedience, and intended for the overthrow, by violence, of all non-Bolshevist governments. Its immediate aim is not the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the dictatorship of a handful of disciplined Communist members exercised over millions of untrained workers. It appeals to force and must maintain itself by the power of arms. Its realization implies in brief the complete subjection of a country to a small Communist bureaucracy in whose hands the entire power is centralized. The Communist party, as correctly described in the pregnant passage quoted above, is thus a disciplined army, prepared for action, but the application of physical force is not to exclude any possible skill and artifice in diplomacy, wherein the Russian leaders have excelled. It scorns the vote and the ballot and worships violence. It has but one aim and that is civil war throughout all the kingdoms and democracies of the earth, until the Communist International shall rule supreme. It seeks the destruction or complete subjugation of all other radical parties, Socialist or Communist, with the same determination that it would abolish capitalism. It is pledged to the overthrow of all religion, although it understands that in this regard it must still move cautiously.

It would annihilate freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of education in the sense that true liberty has in practice been interpreted by it as the right to speak, write and teach International Communism. Opposition to this would clearly be treason to the Communist world government, whose whole national economy, as Lenine writes, is to be carried on "under the management of the armed proletariat" ("The State and Revolution," p. 52). This in turn must ultimately take its orders, as we have seen, in blind obedience from "the full-powered central committee of the party."

Is America ripe for this? We hardly think so. Yet there are employers today determined, it would seem, to force it upon us. They are perhaps the best promoters of the United Communist party in the United States.

JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S.J.

NOTE AND COMMENT

Growth of High-School Education

THERE has been an enormous increase in the number of high schools in the United States. The figures issued by the Federal Bureau of Education indicate that equivalently one high school has been established in this country each day during the past twenty-eight years. Since 1890 the increase in numbers has been 452 per cent. The mailing list of the bureau includes the names of 16,300 high schools. In 1890 only 60.8 per cent of the high schools were under public control, but by 1918 the publicly controlled high schools constituted 87 per cent of the entire number of such institutions. In the former year only 3.2 persons in each 1,000 of the population were enrolled in public high schools. In the latter year the corresponding proportion was 15.6 out of each 1,000 inhabitants. California leads the list in high-school education with 27 persons out of each 1,000 enrolled, and South Carolina closes it with 5.3 persons. The average size of a city high school is 653 students, and of a rural school, 59 students. It is incidentally evident what an enormous burden is placed upon Catholics and upon all who seek to procure that highest good of individuals and nations, a religious education for their children.

A Chaplain's Gift for Austrian Children

AMONG the many letters enclosing donations to relieve somewhat the distress existing in Austria, the following is of particular interest. It is addressed to the Baroness von Rast by a former army chaplain, the Rev. Edward A. Wallace, now stationed at the church of St. Margaret Mary, Manhattan Beach, N. Y. He writes:

Would you be so kind as to forward the enclosed Liberty Bonds or their value to his Eminence, the Cardinal Archbishop of Vienna, Austria, for the destitute children of his Archdiocese. It may interest you to know the history of these two bonds. While serving as chaplain with the American forces in France I picked them up on the battlefield in the Argonne Forest, Oct., 1918. I have made several unsuccessful efforts to locate the rightful owner or his kin but to no purpose. I feel that they could not be put to better use than to alleviate even in a slight degree the suffering of the little Austrian children so dear to the Heart of the Christ Child. I beg you then, my dear Baroness von Rast, to accept them in His Name to be applied by his Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Vienna for whatever charitable purpose may seem most urgent.

It is to be hoped that AMERICA's readers will not forget our Austrian Relief Fund. The acuteness of the situation may be judged by the fact that the Austrian Chancellor was forced on December 11 to notify the Allied governments that the food supply in his country would be exhausted by the end of Decem-

ber. Since Austrian money has practically lost all its value it is impossible to buy abroad. Especially keen, and almost indescribable at times, are the sufferings, embarrassments and hardships undergone by priests and nuns.

The Income-Tax Law in Brief

WHILE each year the public is becoming better educated in the requirements of the revenue laws the returns for 1919 showed that there are sections with which many tax-payers are still unfamiliar. Here is a brief statement of the essential points of the income-tax law:

WHO? Single persons who had net income of \$1,000 or more for the year 1920; married couples who had net income of \$2,000.

WHEN? March 15, 1921, is the final date for filing returns and making first payments.

WHERE? Collector of Internal Revenue for districts in which the person resides.

HOW? Full directions on Form 1040A and Form 1040; also the law and regulations.

WHAT? Four per cent normal tax in taxable income up to \$4,000 in excess of exemption. Eight per cent normal tax on balance of taxable income. Surtax from 1 per cent to 65 per cent on net incomes over \$5,000.

The penalty for failure to meet this obligation is a fine of not more than \$1,000 and an additional assessment of twenty-five per cent of the amount of tax due. Husband and wife must consider the income of both, plus that of minor dependent children, and if the total exceeds \$2,000 a return must be filed. A minor with a net income in his own right of \$1,000 must file a separate return. Copies of the forms containing full instructions for making out returns can be obtained from collectors of internal revenue. Form 1040A applies to persons whose net income for 1920 was \$5,000 or less; form 1040 to those whose income was in excess of this sum. Every county will be duly visited by revenue officers, whose arrival will be announced in the local press, and whose advisory service will be given without cost to taxpayers. A special \$2,000 exemption and an additional credit of \$200 for each dependent is allowed to single persons acting as the support and head of a household. The conditions of this privilege will be detailed here later.

Southern Slavs Lose Mighty Shepherd

IN the death of Dr. Antun Mahnic, Bishop of Veglia (Krk), on December 14, the Southern Slav race lost a great leader. He had initiated the movement for the solidarity of the two Catholic peoples, Croats and Slovenes, and the union with Serbia which was to assure the independence of the Southern Slav State. He was "a fighting prelate," our correspondent, E. Christitch, writes to us. Even as a young priest, holding the chair of scholastic philosophy in Goritsa (Slovenia), he relentlessly engaged in open warfare with the so-called "Liberals."

He refused to accept the notion that the new circles had a monopoly of knowledge, artistic enlightenment, or scientific light. He claimed every merit they arrogated to themselves as an emanation of the Church to which they owed their culture. He challenged their ethics and their intellectual achievements. He created reviews, launched pamphlets for the instruction of the people, showing that the seeds of all knowledge and culture were found in the Catholic Church, and above all, that the doctrine of Christ expounded by His Vicar was the only logical and efficient guide for mankind. He scoffed at their claims to be leaders of modern progress; combated Socialism, materialism, individualism, and proclaimed aloud that for him and his people there was but one "ism": Catholicism.

His uncompromising hostility to the new "lights" resulted in political measures against him. He was removed only to be promoted to a See in Croatia where his former principles were reduced to action. He successfully fought the gnostic forces,

inspired Catholic association and built up a strong Catholic press. Italian opposition and later armed invasion prevented the realization of his dearest plan for a Yugoslav seminary in Istria. At this time, too, the controversy between Slavs and Italians regarding the replacing of the Glagolite by the Latin liturgy was raging. As a Slovene, unacquainted with the Croat dialect, he was presumed to be indifferent to this subject. His opinion was asked by the Regent of Triest, Baron Rinaldini.

With his usual frankness Bishop Mahnic replied that he had not yet studied the question sufficiently to decide. But he added: "If I find the use of the Glagolite conducive to the spiritual well-being of my people I warn your Excellency that I will uphold it with all my power." A Papal Decree, issued in 1898, allowed the retention of the Glagolite liturgy in those parishes where it was customary, and at a synod held in Veglia, in 1901, Bishop Mahnic gave it a solemn authorization in such specific places. Italian reclamation, however, ended in a summons from Rome to the Bishop to come and explain the detailed workings of the synod's decision, and, like Sts. Cyril and Methodius, authors of the Glagolite, he went to justify himself before the Congregation of the Holy Office. The satisfaction of a thorough vindication was his, and the press that had accused him was forced to withdraw its statements and apologize.

At the outbreak of the Great War Bishop Mahnic took a firm stand for the cause of national unity and autonomy of the Southern Slavs. Denounced as a suspect he suffered many vexations, but did not cease from publishing the remarkable articles that thrilled all Croatia. The Armistice brought fresh troubles instead of deliverance. Italy came to seize what Austria relinquished. His last days were embittered by imprisonment in Italy after the seizure of the lands which had been the scene of his labors, and by a raid of D'Annunzio on his episcopal palace even while he lay on his deathbed in Zagreb. Those around him kept from his knowledge to the last the Rapallo Treaty which ceded to Italy a vast portion of that Slav population to which he was so attached and in which he had nourished alike the love of religion and of Slav nationality. His own love of the Church was expressed in his dying moments when he called repeatedly to his secretary, Dr. Palcic: "Say them aloud again for me, say them aloud, the beautiful prayers of our Church." In Bishop Mahnic the Church on earth has lost a strong pillar, and the Southern Slav race a mighty shepherd.

Protestant Churches on "Open-Shop" Drive

VOICING "the representative Protestant view of the 'open-shop' drive," the Commission on Church and Special Service of the Council of the Churches of Christ in America declares its own convictions to be "in thorough accord with the recent utterances of the National Catholic Welfare Council." The Commission says:

The relations between employers and workers throughout the United States are seriously affected at this moment by a campaign which is being conducted for the "open" shop policy—the so-called American plan of employment. These terms are now being frequently used to designate establishments that are definitely anti-union. Obviously, a shop of this kind is not an "open" shop, but a closed shop—closed against members of labor unions.

We feel impelled to call public attention to the fact that a very wide-spread impression exists that the present "open" shop campaign is inspired in many quarters by this antagonism to union labor. Many disinterested persons are convinced that an attempt is being made to destroy the organized labor movement. Any such attempt must be viewed with apprehension by fair-minded people.

The Council of the Churches of Christ in America, for which the Commission speaks, represents thirty-one Evangelical Churches. Its utterance, as it rightly says, is in full accord in the present instance with the strong and timely warning sent out by the representatives of the Catholic Bishops' Welfare Council.